THE

CHRISTIAN REFORMER.

No. CCVI.] FEBRUARY, 1862. [Vol. XVIII.

DR. JOSEPH WOLFF.*

Of all the strange books which this eccentricity-seeking age has called into being, the volumes of which we give the title below may prefer a claim to pre-eminence. They are wild in speculation, disjointed in style, with not the slightest pretension to method, and there is scarcely a chapter which does not suggest reasons for doubting the good Doctor's sanity. His vanity is intense, and leads him again and again into trifling and ridiculous details. Notwithstanding these serious drawbacks, the book is not merely readable, but is generally interesting and sometimes instructive. The strange adventures of the author, if narrated systematically and with any literary skill, might have furnished materials for a work scarcely inferior in interest to the Travels of Livingstone. It is, in fact, a chaos of Dr. Joseph Wolff's talk, taken down from his lips by certain admiring friends. One of them, Mr. Alfred Gatty, acts as editor. What he says of his friend's written books, that they "have been remarkably muddled," may not untruly describe this dictated autobiography. Mr. Gatty quotes and apparently adopts the encomium of an unnamed critic, that it will be "a standard book like Robinson Crusoe." A less happy comparison could scarcely have been made. Every quality that Defoe possessed as a writer of professed autobiography is wanting in this work. No one will praise these volumes for simplicity in narrative, happy portraiture of character, the essentially dramatic power of the conversations, or the absence of all unnecessary appearance of the writer. But Dr. Joseph Wolff has some noble qualities, which no amount of eccentricity can hide from our view. He has faith in his creed to enthusiasm, and a self-denying and, what is better still, courageous benevolence, which all must admire, though few will imitate it. His temper, though here and there it exhibits some flaws, is essentially kind and genial. His editor pleads that some irritability may be excused in a man whose pulse ordinarily beats more than a hundred strokes a minute.

Without pretending to reduce the chaos into perfect order, we propose, before selecting a few extracts from these volumes, to mention some particulars of Dr. Wolff's singular career.

* Travels and Adventures of the Rev. Joseph Wolff, D.D., LL.D. 2 vols. 8vo. Saunders, Otley and Co. Second Edition. 1861.

Joseph Wolff claims to be descended from a celebrated German rabbi, Jonathan Eubeschütz, elevated by one of the Electors of Saxony to the baronial rank, under the title of Baron Von Alderfeld. His features are described, and the engraved portrait of him confirms the description, as not markedly of the Hebrew type. His beard, during his life abroad, reddish in hue and a foot in length, extorted from an Eastern courtier the compliment, "You look like a lion!"

Joseph Wolff was born in the year 1795, at Weilersbach. His father was a Jewish rabbi, whose family belonged to the tribe of Levi. Terrified by the invasion of the French, his parents soon after his birth removed to Kissingen, and afterwards successively to Halle, in Saxony, and Ullfeld, in Bavaria.

Marvellous tales are told of Joseph's youthful mental experiences, and of influences tending to draw him to Christianity. These influences had their completion at the Roman Catholic Lyceum of Bamberg. Of his studies in Roman Catholic colleges and monasteries, we cannot stop to recount the history. Among other places, he studied at the Propaganda of Rome, but was dismissed for heretical tendencies, which embarrassed his teachers and endangered the faith of his companions in study. He found friends at every change in a manner that reads more like a fairy romance than sober biographical reality. One of these opportune friends was the late Henry Drummond, the banker, by whose instrumentality he was taken to the Jews' Episcopal chapel at Bethnal Green, and so favourably impressed by the services and conversation of Mr. Hawtrey, the clergyman at the head of the establishment, that his conversion was completed and the foundations well laid of his attachment to the discipline and ritual of the Church of England. He was sent to Cambridge at the expense of the Society for promoting Christianity amongst the Jews. Here for two years he studied theology under Simeon, and the Eastern languages under Dr. Lee. He describes himself as rising at two o'clock in the morning, giving the least possible time to his meals, and studying fourteen hours a day.

In process of time, Wolff's theology became a curious amalgam of the wildest dreams of the prophetical and millenarian school with the more prosaic pretensions of the High-church party. From Cambridge he was called by the sharp remonstrances of Henry Drummond, who eagerly desired to see the enthusiasm of his friend directed to missionary work. The field traversed by him in his first journey as a Christian missionary was a wide one, extending over Palestine, Syria, Egypt, Persia, Armenia, Circassia, the Crimea, Smyrna, &c. He reached Dublin on his return in May, 1826.

In London he visited Irving, in whom he says he detected a large development of "the organ of being humbugged; no deceiver himself, he was yet liable to be deceived by others."

Joseph Wolff became, but after he left Cambridge, an enthusiastic believer in the doctrine and virtue of apostolical succession, and holds preferment as an ordained priest of the Church of England, having for sixteen years been the vicar of Ile (Isle?) Brewers, in Somersetshire.

It is to Wolff's credit that he has through life put prominently forward his Hebrew extraction, and shewn an earnest desire to call the people of his native faith to the knowledge and reception of the gospel of Jesus Christ. It is as a missionary to the Jews in Persia, Bokhara, Cashmeer and various other countries, that he has established his reputation. While seeking in the first instance the children of Israel, he has not neglected in his proselyting zeal the disciples of Mohammed. It is a prevailing mistake that Wolff was sent in the first instance out by the London Society for promoting Christianity among the Jews. They wished and designed to send him to Poland. He pleaded hard to go to Jerusalem. The council were divided in purpose, when Henry Drummond stepped forward and undertook at his own expense to send him to the holy city,—very wisely, under all the circumstances, leaving him altogether unfettered in his plans, laying down neither rules nor orders, telling him he might, if he chose, "cry out in the midst of the streets of Jerusalem." The same generous patron took upon himself the publication of Wolff's journals. His enthusiasm was attended by éclat, if not large success; and the Society, not having in any quarter large results to shew from its labours, desired to secure to itself the reputation of an agent so earnest and popular. After five years' labours, during which time he had been liberally aided by the Society, he became their recognized agent, and in that character travelled all over England, Ireland, Scotland and Wales.

Joseph pleads that he is wholly uninfluenced by a spirit of *tuft-hunting*, and cares nothing for the great and noble save as they love the Lord Jesus and his work. The autobiography scarcely confirms this statement; its pages are plentifully strewed with the names of great men at home and abroad with whom Joseph talked and lived. In the very year that he entered into official connection with the Jews' Society, he formed an alliance of a more tender nature, having succeeded in gaining the affections of Lady Georgiana Mary Walpole, daughter of the second Earl of Orford. It was in preparation for this alliance that Wolff was, at an expense of £200, naturalized. His friend, Mr. Eneas Mackintosh, on this occasion advanced the necessary amount for fees, &c. Joseph pleads guilty to an earlier experience of the tender passion:

"He has already mentioned in his first volume that, when at Tripolis, in Syria, he fell in love with the beautiful widow, Mrs. Katziflis—and what man is there who did never fall in love? Even Luther said—

'Wine, women, and song,
I will love all my life long.'

"But Wolff did not mention the reason why his courtship was broken off, which he will now do. Wolff asked this lady what she thought of the conversion of the Jews? when she replied, that if the Jews ever became Christians, she would become a Turk; and curse the Jews for having forced her to forsake her beautiful and holy religion!

"*Wolff.*—'But I have been a Jew!'

"*Mrs. Katziflis.*—'We all here say that you are so different from all the Jews in features, look, and actions; that we are persuaded you must have been the illegitimate son of some Christian nobleman.' Wolff left her at that very moment when she spoke!"—II. 448, 449.

Joseph admits that his anxieties were, during the dangers of his missionary life, not a little increased by his recollections of the sorrowing wife at home:

"Dr. Wolff must here observe, that among all nations the observance of celibacy is considered a state in which a man can serve God better than in married life. The one thing which must be said is, that there ought to be no forced celibacy; and that a man should be allowed to carry a wife with him, as Paul and Peter did, according both to ecclesiastical history and the Gospel. And Wolff must say, by his own experience, that a roaming missionary ought never to think of marrying. For God only knows how Wolff suffered from being in a distant country, and having to feel that he had left behind him a wife. He took Francis Xavier as his model, but Francis Xavier was not married; and it is a great struggle still with Wolff to decide, whether he was right or not, in undertaking perilous journeys of many thousands of miles, separated from a wife whom he tenderly loved, and who had remained behind, and (as he heard) often in tears on his account, although a woman of a very powerful and religious mind. Oh! Georgiana, Georgiana, pardon me, if I have done wrong! But enough of that."—II. 77.

Wolff more than once refers to the authority of Xavier in justification of his own practices and tastes. He finds in the recorded conversations of the saint authority for his own love of humour, although we greatly doubt whether the great Romish missionary would have ventured on some of the escapades in talk of his would-be antitype.

Dr. Wolff twice journeyed into Bokhara. In the first instance, he penetrated Central Asia simply for missionary purposes, to preach the gospel to the Jews in Bokhara, Affghanistan and Hindostan, to find traces of the ten tribes of Israel, to study the history of the Jews of central Asia, and also to inquire about the descendants of the army of Alexander the Great, said to be found on the heights of Himalaya. Twelve years afterwards he paid his second visit to Bokhara. The motive of this expedition indicates the impulsive character of Wolff. Being in company with Hookham Frere, an observation that fell from that gentleman respecting the mystery that surrounded the fate of Colonel Stoddart and Captain Conolly, roused the enthusiasm of our

missionary, and he resolved on the instant to penetrate Bokhara, and be the means of liberating our countrymen if alive, or of ascertaining their fate if dead.

Wolff's adventures and sufferings far transcend the ordinary experience of the boldest missionaries. Forty years ago, in his mission to Palestine after leaving Gaza, he fell into the hands of banditti, who robbed him of everything. Two years after, he was struck down by fever at Jerusalem. The next year, when in Mesopotamia, he received 200 lashes from the Kurds. At the foot of Mount Caucasus he was again seriously ill, suffering from typhus fever. In 1827, he suffered shipwreck on the shore of Cephalonia. At Cairo he was ill again. In 1830, he was robbed by pirates near Salonica. Then he was captured and made a slave in Khorassan. The incident of Wolff's being enslaved occurred in his first mission to Bokhara. He quitted Burchund, attended by a suitable escort. But when the men in attendance learnt that horsemen belonging to a reckless chief named Muhammad were wandering about seeking for victims whom they might make slaves of, some of them deserted him and sought safety in flight. The adventure that followed justified their fears:

"When Wolff had ridden on before the rest, and was only a quarter of a mile distant from Sangerd, he suddenly heard a firing from all sides, and saw the flashes of the guns as they were fired off; and this was accompanied by dreadful yellings and screams from the barbarians. *Ammaan!* was the cry, which means 'Safety,' and Wolff might have saved himself, but he was determined to share common fate with the rest, and so he returned to his companions, when he saw an awful sight. His servant and all the rest were already tied to the horses' tails of a banditti who surrounded them. All these prisoners had been stripped entirely naked; and at last, one of the robbers rode up to Wolff, with a countenance of hell, and a gun in his hand, with a smoking torch upon it, and he continually exclaimed, 'Pool, pool!' which means 'Money, money!' Wolff gave his purse to him, and he said, 'Have you more money?' Wolff answered, 'Yes, in my trunk.' Then he said, 'When my companions come, don't tell them that I have taken your money, for those horrid fiends, the Kerahe, rob among themselves again.' At last, the whole troop rode up to Wolff, yelling, 'Pool! pool! pool!' Wolff said, 'I have given my money into the hands of this fellow.' They then gave their companion a tremendous beating, and took the money from him. Then they said to Wolff, 'Now, you dismount.' He obeyed; when they stripped him naked, like Adam and Eve when they were created, and tied him with a long rope to a horse's tail; and one with a whip came behind and flogged him.

"Wolff prayed!—in such hours one learns to pray.

"The chief of the gang, a horrid-looking fellow, of black complexion, with a blue diseased tongue, came up to him, and asked him, 'Who art thou?' and Wolff replied, breathing hard, and scarcely able to speak, 'I am a follower of Jesus;' and the chief, horror-struck, replied, 'A

follower of Jesus?' 'Yes,' Wolff said, 'a follower of Jesus! and I go about for his sake.'

"Wolff found out during his travels among savages, that it is exactly with them as it is with the devil himself; for they believe in Jesus, but it is a belief which makes them tremble; it is a torment to them.

"The chief immediately gave orders that Wolff should be untied and allowed to ride upon one of the horses; and they put a few rags around him to make him more comfortable. The road was covered with snow and ice, and they diverged out of the road, and at last encamped in a forest, where they made an immensely large fire; they then made free with Wolff's tea, sugar, and things, which he had brought; and they also broke open the cases of dates and pomegranates. Then they set a value upon the slaves they had taken, and Wolff's servant was valued at ten tomauns, equal to 5*l.*, but when they came up to Wolff and looked at him, they said, 'We don't like this fellow at all; he stares at us so.' Then one of them said, 'He is worth five tomauns, equal to 2*l.* 10*s.*;' whilst another one said, 'I would not give half that price for him.'"—I. 489—491.

His captors deliberated what they should do with their prisoner, who excited their fears; and they came to the conclusion that the best way would be to kill him and throw the blame on the Turcomauns. After various adventures and exposure to extreme perils, he and fifty others were thrown into a dungeon. Wolff's danger was greater than that of his companions in misery; for as it was the purpose of his captors to starve him to death, they omitted him when rations were supplied to other prisoners. His narrative of the mode of rescue, and of the character of the man by whose authority he was saved, is perfectly oriental:

"But after Wolff had been chained for about two hours, with those fifty other poor people, who were pouring out 2500 curses upon the head of Aboubeker; and, whilst Joseph Wolff was praying for them, suddenly the thunder of cannon was heard from the tower, and a voice exclaimed, 'Muhammad Iszhak Khan has arrived!'

"At once the scene was changed; for a person approached who made Wolff's chains more easy, and then a man came to the door of the dungeon, who opened it, and exclaimed, 'Is there not an Englishman here?' Wolff answered, 'Yes! yes! yes!'

"It was a Persian officer of the great Khan, who had arrived and spoken thus; and then he said, in great anger to the robbers, 'Pedr-Sookhtè,' which means, 'Oh that your father may be burned;' adding, 'Away with the chains from the Englishman and all the rest, for slavery is at an end throughout Torbab-Hydarcea!' The chains were immediately taken off, and Joseph Wolff was made free; and not only he and his fifty companions in the dungeon, but also above two hundred others were set at liberty. Attributing their release to Wolff, the people all exclaimed, when he appeared in the street, 'Oh, thou hast been an angel sent from the Lord! Oh, thou hast been an angel sent from the Lord!'

"Wolff was now brought, with his fifty companions, to the palace of the great Khan, where he saw hundreds of miserable wretches with

their eyes cut out, and their ears and noses cut off. And he was introduced into the presence of Muhammad Iszhak Khan, of whom it is related that he had killed, with his own hand, his father, mother, brother, sister, and son-in-law; and so awful was his bodily strength, that he would sometimes take hold of a prisoner, and tear his skull in two. This tyrant had sold 60,000 Persians, people of his own religion, and subjects of his own king, to the Kings of Bokhara and Khiva, who were enemies to both his religion and country. Muhammad Iszhak Khan was eating his dinner when Wolff approached him, and he said, 'Abbas Mirza has written to me, that thou goest about to show to the nations the way of truth. For my part, I have no religion. I have already passed this world, and the other world. I have got, however, one good quality, and that is, I am a man of justice: I love strict justice; and, therefore, tell me the truth, and you shall see my justice. How much money have these rascals taken from you?'

"Wolff said, 'They have taken from me eighty tomauns.'

"He repeated, 'Eighty tomauns?'

"Wolff replied, 'Yes.'

"He then said, 'Now thou shalt see my justice.' So he instantly ordered Hassan Khan Coord, and all his followers, to be dreadfully flogged. He extorted from them every farthing; and, after he had got back Wolff's money, he counted it, and said, 'Now thou shalt see my justice;' and, putting the money into his own pocket, without giving Wolff a single penny, he added, 'Now you may go in peace.'"—I. 500—502.

In his journey to Madras he was attacked by cholera, after exposure to a soaking storm, during which he was compelled to sit in his palanquin, which was filled with water up to his neck. His life was despaired of, and the doctor tried the native remedy of branding the stomach of the patient three times with a hot iron. A long sleep ensued. While under its influence, the bungalow in which Wolff lay was burned down, and he in a state of unconsciousness was carried out into the open street. Then a bilious fever came on, and for twenty days he lay between life and death. Of his extreme danger, in 1832, in the Doab, we shall presently give an account partly in his own words. It tells alike to the credit of Wolff and of the officers of the two branches of Her Majesty's service, that in every extremity he found timely aid and most gratifying sympathy from British officers. Whether or not these gentlemen sympathized with the religious enthusiasm of our missionary, they treated him with consideration and tenderness. This circumstance seems to have made a profound impression upon his mind, and when he heard of the imprisonment of Stoddart and Conolly, he said to Lady Georgiana, "Now I am going to Bokhara to try to pay back a debt of gratitude which I owe to British officers."

Wolff left Bokhara in his first journey in the month of April, 1832. In the Indian Caucasus he satisfied himself as to one of the points of investigation he had undertaken. Near to Hindoo-Koosh, he entered a singularly beautiful valley.

"It was situated between two mountains of immense height, which rose, like sloping walls, on each side; and the valley itself was covered over with the most exquisite verdure and flowers. Springs were there, with water clear as crystal, and it reminded the beholder of Paradisaical beauty. Wolff walked on for a considerable distance through this lovely vale, and at last arrived amongst hills which were cut with ravines; and there, it is said, that the Balkhwee savages go roaming about, and are making and are made slaves. These people are completely naked, and of copper colour; and upon the heights of those mountains the Kafir Seeahpoosh are wandering. They call themselves 'Seema,' and are believed by some to be descendants of the army of Alexander the Great; but Wolff cannot help thinking that they are remnants of the tribes of Israel; for the Jews in Bokhara themselves, who do not call themselves Jews, but children of Israel, and who assert that they belong to the ten tribes, say that those Kafir Seeahpoosh are their brethren whose ancestors had entirely forgotten their law, and had fallen into idolatry—but into the ancient idolatry. They call God 'Imrah,' and they worship the figure of a fish, called 'Dagon.' They have in their mountains the ten commandments written upon stone; and their women observe the law of purification. They hate the Muhammadans with a perfect hatred; but they love the Jews, and as often as they kill a Muhammadan, they put a feather in their head-dress. Hence the proverb, 'He has got a feather in his cap.' Their colour is perfectly white, like that of Europeans." II. 37, 38.

Proceeding onwards to Doab, he had the misfortune to fall into the hands of a singularly cruel Mohammedan tribe.

"Wolff was called by his people 'Hajee Joseph Wolff.' The Hazara of Dooab took offence at this, and said, 'Why do you dare to take the name of *Hajee*, as you are not a Muhammadan?' Wolff said, 'Even the Muhammadans in Bokhara, and in Arabia, recognize, as *Hajee*, all Jews and Christians, who have been in Jerusalem.'

"They replied, 'This is not the custom here among us, we are here Kharijee,' *i.e.* 'seceders from all the rest.' 'With us many things are not allowed which are allowed by other Muhammadans.'

"Wolff replied, 'I could not know your usage, for I have but just arrived here among you; so all you can do is not to call me *Hajee*, and I shall tell my people not to call me *Hajee*.'

"But, said they, 'The mischief is done, and therefore you must either say, 'There is God, and nothing but God, and Muhammad the prophet of God; or we will sow you up in a dead donkey, burn you alive, and make sausages of you.'

"Wolff said, 'There is God, and nothing but God, and Jesus the Son of God.'

"They at once now gave a sign, and all their Moollahs assembled in a large cave, hewn out of the rock. The Affghans who accompanied Wolff, as well as his three servants, trembled with anguish, and said to him, 'Say the creed, and the moment you are on your journey again, you may just be what you were before.' Wolff replied, 'Leave me, and let me alone. I will manage them.'"—II. 38, 39.

After making some arrangements with his servants, he entered the cave in which the Doab Mohammedans were assembled in

council, carrying with him certain firmans which he had received from the Sultan at Constantinople. He found them seated with the Koran before them, on the point of deciding that he must be put to death. How Joseph passed through this terrible crisis with life, himself shall tell:

"Wolff said, 'What humbug is that! You cannot dare to put me to death! You will be putting a guest to death!'

"They replied, 'The Koran decides so.'

"Wolff said, 'It is a lie! The Koran says, on the contrary, that a guest should be respected, even if he is an infidel; and here, see the great firman that I have from the khalif of the whole Muhammadan religion from Stamboul! You have no power to put me to death. You must send me to Muhammad Moorad Beyk, at Kondoz. Have you not seen how little afraid I am of you? I have told the Affghans already that they should disperse, and probably some of them have already gone to Kondoz.'

"When they heard the name of Muhammad Moorad Beyk, they actually began to tremble, and asked Wolff, 'Do you know him?' As Wolff could not say that he knew him, he replied, 'This you will have to find out.' They said, 'Then you must purchase your blood with all you have.' Wolff answered, 'This will I do. For I am a dervish, and do not mind either money, clothing or anything.'

"And thus Wolff had to surrender everything. Oh! if his friends in England could have seen him then, they would have stared at him. Naked like Adam and Eve, and without even an apron of leaves to dress himself with, he continued his journey; and as soon as he was out of sight of the Hazara, he witnessed a sight which he never thought to have seen among Muhammadans. All his Affghan companions knelt down, and one of them, holding the palm of his hand upwards to him, offered up the following extempore prayer:—

'O God! O God!
Thanks be to Thy name,
That Thou hast saved this stranger
Out of the lion's den.
Thanks, thanks, thanks,
Be to Thy holy name.
Bring him safely back
Unto his country,
Unto his family.
Amen.'"—II. 40—42.

That this Mohammedan prayer of mercy was fulfilled, and that, wanting money, food and raiment, he passed unhurt, travelling week after week in this pitiful condition, almost transcends belief. The editor says in explanation:

"When he tells us of his walk, without a rag of clothing on, for 600 miles, from the Dooab to the Punjaub through storms and snow, and one questions whether any human frame could endure the exposure?—the fact loses its improbability in the minds of those who know that he can walk barefoot along stone passages in winter, sleep with door and window open in the foggy nights of Yorkshire, and that, unless he has his cold shower-bath in the morning, he is apt to be irritable and oppressed. His powerful frame, too, hirsute and indifferent to climate,

never wears an extra coat; and as to mucous membrane, he seems to have no such delicate lining."—II. viii.

During this perilous journey he fell in with the Ghilzyes. He describes them as

"— a cruel people, and, though there was snow on the mountain, they turned Wolff out of their houses. But he spoke to them at last with such persuasion, reminding them of Abraham, who would not have done so, that they permitted him to sleep among them, and brought him milk.

"He told them that history informs us that Abraham was once reproved by God for having turned out of his tent a fire-worshipper; God saying to him, 'I have had patience seventy years with that fire-worshipper, and thou wouldst not have patience with him one night!' And Wolff added that he was not a fire-worshipper, but a believer in God and in Jesus, the Word of God!

"Next morning, he set out early, and hastened down the mountain, for the snow was blowing continually against his face; and he had to run along, with his head turned away as much as he could from the drift. And, more than once, the Affghans had to pull him out from the snow into which he had fallen.

"At last he reached the foot of the mountain, where he found an eternal spring. The whole country was covered with mulberry trees, of which Wolff ate in abundance; and he drank from the beautiful spring of water."—II. 43, 44.

He soon after reached Cabul, and there, by the forethought and mediation of Lord William Bentinck (of whose friendship, as well as that of Lady Bentinck, Wolff speaks on many occasions with warm gratitude), he was not only cared for, but sumptuously arrayed and treated with the utmost consideration. At Calcutta, he was the guest of the Governor-General, and not only lectured, but preached *every day for six successive days, twelve hours each day.* He does not tell us whether he or his hearers suffered most from this extraordinary feat.

In his lectures he advocated his favourite doctrine of the Millennium, and fixed upon the year 1847 as that in which the personal reign of Christ would begin. He candidly expresses his present sense of his folly. We would commend to Dr. Cumming's attention the words of confession of our missionary, who certainly was as skilled in prophetic science as the London orator. Wolff is describing a visit he paid to Captain Havelock (afterwards Sir William):

"He expounded to them his own doctrine on the personal reign of Christ, and the restoration of the Jewish nation to their own land, and their future conversion to Christianity. He also told them that those mighty events would take place in the year 1847; and if now an opponent were to ask Wolff, 'Why did you fix that time?' he has but one answer to give, which he candidly gives to every one, 'Because I was a great ass!'"—II. 129.

Should Dr. Cumming so far conquer himself as to imitate Dr.

Wolff's candour, we will take care to record the instructive circumstance of his appearing in so novel a character. But the charlatans both of the pulpit and the press never acknowledge themselves mistaken. Joseph records some conversations and intercourse in India with Mohammedans and Christian heretics, which are sufficiently curious:

"Wolff was sent for, during his stay [at Bokhara], by the excellent Goosh-Bekee, and found him surrounded by the chief merchants of Affghanistan, and by the Serkerdehaa, *i.e.* 'the aristocracy of the empire;' when the Goosh-Bekee said, 'As you have, Joseph Wolff, so well obeyed the commands of the king, which were given to you, through me; and as you have not meddled with Mussulmans in the cities of Bokhara-Shereef (*i.e.* 'Bokhara the noble'), you may now enter into conversation, in my presence, with these learned people here; and we shall ask you questions, and you will answer them; and you may ask questions, and we shall answer you. Tell us, then, how can you believe that Jesus is God, whilst he is man?' Wolff replied, 'God is in everything; in one he is present with his power; in another, with his wisdom; in others, with his goodness—but in Jesus the fulness of the Godhead was bodily manifested; and He had no human father, as the Koran itself testifies; but He was in God, even the Son of God, from eternity.'

"The Goosh-Bekee said, 'How can this be?'

"Wolff said, 'The sun has its rays, and heat, and light; and they are all one with the sun, and cannot be divided.'

"Goosh-Bekee said, 'We call him, therefore, the *Word* of God in the Koran!'

"Wolff said, 'This very expression is also taken from the Anjeel, (*i.e.* 'the Gospel'). And it explains the divinity of Jesus even still more strongly than the term *Son*. For, as the word of man is one with man, and cannot be divided, or separated from him, so the word of God cannot be separated from God, and is one with God.'"—II. 20, 21.

We suspect, if we may judge from other recorded conversations between Mohammedans and orthodox Christians, that these Mohammedans had more to say about this strange doctrine of God-man than Joseph Wolff has cared to charge his memory with. He perhaps resembles a worthy divine of whom we have heard, who is fond of theological argument, but, being very deaf, is compelled to use a trumpet when conversing. Now his friends allege that, when the good divine is inconveniently pressed in argument, down goes the trumpet, and the assailants' arguments are at once denied access to his ears. So Joseph Wolff believes his memory to be as accurate as tenacious (on that point we shall have a word to offer presently); but even if he listens patiently to opposing arguments, it need surprise no one that has realized Joseph's idiosyncrasy, that he remembers his own arguments and words better than those of other people. Mr. Gatty does not conceal his hero's acknowledged weakness:

"Dr. Wolff calls himself very vain—and so he is; and 'Joseph Wolff'

is dear unto himself, after a certain fashion, which is unlike the egotism of most of us. He prides himself on little things—he likes small attentions—the fondlings of a little child will gratify him—and a large congregation, or audience, will make him believe that he has preached like St. Paul, or lectured like Plato."—II. ix.

At Calcutta, Dr. Wolff fell in with Mr. William Adam, then a Unitarian missionary in that city:

"Wolff then went to the Jewish quarter, and conversed with the white and black Jews; and he also visited a remarkable man, of whom he spoke with too great severity in his 'Researches and Missionary Labours,' published in 1835. For, though Wolff believed him to be most essentially in error, yet error, proceeding even from conviction founded upon false premises, ought to be treated and combated with great tenderness. William Adam is the name of the gentleman alluded to. He was formerly a Baptist missionary, and, fired with zeal for promoting the doctrine of the divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, he entered into a discussion with the celebrated Ramohun Roy, an Unitarian, and was completely defeated by him. Mr. Adam's visage, however, appears to Wolff to be that of a man who feels himself unhappy, and therefore seeking the truth with seriousness; for there is no doubt that the principles of the Unitarians cannot inspire men with cheerfulness. This was the case with the great Unitarian, Channing, who, shortly before his death, expressed himself in a letter, as far as Wolff recollects (and his memory does not fail him in such matters), in the following manner. He wrote, 'I feel daily more dissatisfied with the religion of Belsham and Priestley. I wish to be united with the whole catholic Church throughout the world.' And thus Dr. Wolff now pants daily, more and more, after being united with the whole catholic Church throughout the world, in spirit and in truth. And he also desires to feel a stronger communion with the Church above."—II. 166, 167.

A few remarks are necessary on this passage. Not having the pleasure of Mr. Adam's acquaintance, we can neither question nor confirm Joseph's statement respecting his visage. But it is dangerous to found a theological argument on a man's features and their expression. Unitarians, like other men, have livers and biliary secretions, and a disordered bodily system may soon discharge from the visage all the cheerfulness which a benign theology inspires. If Joseph Wolff had enjoyed familiar intercourse with Unitarians, as we have for half a century or more, he would know that happier and more cheerful men and women do not exist. Unitarianism has been defined the religion of common sense and goodnature, and something may be said in justification of the definition.

If Dr. Wolff, in his reference to Channing, designs to intimate that that great and good man abandoned Unitarian doctrine for a more orthodox and catholic system, he is grievously in error. The biographer and nephew of Dr. Channing, alluding to the rumour that on his death-bed his uncle changed his opinions, declared, "once for all, that there was *no foundation whatever* for such a rumour" (Memoir, Vol. II., Note B, p. 499).

Now let us test Joseph's accuracy of memory by a reference to the whole passage of which he affects to quote a part. Writing to Mr. W. Trevilcock, Aug. 29, 1841, Dr. Channing remarks,

"I am strongly opposed to Methodism, not for its speculative errors, but for its spirit of domination. No sect seems to me more fettered, or to have more the spirit of a sect. It is a religious aristocracy, combining a great power for narrow ends. As I grow older, I grieve more and more at the impositions on the human mind, at the machinery by which the few keep down the many. I distrust sectarian influence more and more. I am more detached from a denomination, and strive to feel more my connection with the Universal Church, with all good and holy men. I am little of a Unitarian, have little sympathy with the system of Priestley and Belsham, and stand aloof from all but those who strive and pray for clearer light, who look for a purer and more effectual manifestation of Christian truth." (Memoir, Vol. II. p. 390.)

It is necessary again and again to meet and put down orthodox misrepresentation. Dr. Channing's desire to be free from the fetters of *sectarianism* has been felt by not a few who accepted with less reserve than he did the theology of Priestley and Belsham. We are quite willing to give credit to Dr. Wolff's desire of catholicism, although his autobiography furnishes some illustrations of the cramping and narrowing influence of an Established Church, with its dogmatic articles and severe creeds.

Of Dr. Wolff's second journey into Bokhara, much need not be said. His fears as to the fate of the two brave men, about whom so much solicitude was felt, were but too soon and too exactly fulfilled.

We have neglected to mention that Dr. Wolff received episcopal ordination in America from the hands of Bishop Doane, after undergoing examination in the Articles of the Church, &c.; and he tells us that in America he preached on the doctrines of the Trinity and the Divinity of Christ, *proving them from the Old Testament.*

On one subject, Wolff's moral courage flinched:

"Wolff never entered, during his stay in America, on the question of slavery, for he said, 'I do not wish to mix myself up with your domestic affairs.' This made him beloved by all the Americans; and nothing could be more kind than they were to him."—II. 315.

If the same temporizing spirit had influenced him among the Jews and Mussulmans of Bokhara, the name of Wolff would never have been known to the world, and he would not have deserved (and probably would not have received) Sir Charles Napier's panegyric, that Dr. Wolff "has worked harder for religion, and gone through more dangers for it, with a brave heart, than any man living."

Were we to quote Joseph's accounts of his visions, and some of his preachings and conversations, we should more than justify the supposition which not a few persons have entertained, that his

intellects are at times partially disordered. But, pitying these eccentricities, we can still respect the sincerity of his convictions and the earnestness of his spirit.

Before we part from the book, we will quote a passage in illustration of the singular phenomenon of the uniformity of Jewish faith and ceremonies:

"There is not in any religion upon earth, not even in the Roman Catholic churches, nor in the Eastern churches, nor in the Church of England, such uniformity of ceremonies, and uniformity of thought, and uniformity of legends, and uniformity of actions in the forms of prayer, so strong and exact as in the Jewish religion. As, for instance, this history of the belief about the strength of Judah, and the agility of Naphthali, and the sweet singing of Zarah, the daughter of Ashur, may be heard among the Jews in Houndsditch as well as in the city of Bokhara. The Jewish mode of bowing in prayer is the same in Bokhara, as it is in Duke Street, London, amongst the Portuguese Jews. The very same formularies of prayers—the very same feelings and expressions obtain in Bokhara as in St. Mary Axe; and amongst the Jews also of Hungary. When Wolff reached Bokhara, they were just commemorating the feast of Purim; and, when they read the Book of Esther, every time the name of Haman was mentioned, even the Jewish children and boys of Bokhara struck with a hammer upon the benches in the synagogue, just as they are struck both in London and Amsterdam. The principal Jews of Bokhara get drunk at that feast: a practice which is religiously observed at Jerusalem, and in the 'holy congregation' there, as well as at Dusseldorf, in Germany. They fast, on the day of Atonement, for four-and-twenty hours in Bokhara; just as they fast, for four-and-twenty hours, in London and all over Europe. The Jews blow the trumpet at the beginning of the new year in Bokhara, as they do at the beginning of the Jewish new year everywhere in Europe. They wait and pray there for the redemption of Israel, through the Messiah the son of David, just as they do all over the world."—II. 10—12.

If there be this uniformity of faith throughout the world among the Jews, what will Dr. Wolff say to their unanimous rejection of the doctrine of the Trinity and their inexpressible aversion to Christianity, because as generally received it promulgates doctrine inconsistent with the supremacy and sole Deity of Jehovah?

Here is a singular tradition, which in childhood Wolff learned from his father, Rabbi David:

"And of our blessed Lord he told the young Wolff a curious tradition, or rather read it to him out of the Jewish Talmud, which contains a treatise on the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus. Therein Titus is described as the most wicked man in existence, and it is related of him that he died from the tortures produced by a little fly of copper which entered his brain during the siege, and increased in size until it became as large as a dove, and tormented him to death. But when he was dead, a man named Onkelos, then a heathen prince skilled in the practice of sorcery, though afterwards a Jewish convert, celebrated for his commentaries on the Bible, came forward and raised Titus to life by magic, and then asked him how he would treat the Jews? To which Titus replied,

that he should ill-treat them, and inflict upon them every possible torture. Upon this, Onkelos raised Jesus of Nazareth also from the dead, and asked Him how the Jews ought to be treated? And Jesus of Nazareth answered, 'Treat them well.'"—I. 5.

At Alexandria, Wolff heard from a learned Jewish physician something respecting ancient manuscript copies of the Pentateuch:

"Dr. Marpurgo gave him an account of the manuscript of the Pentateuch, preserved in one of the synagogues at Cairo, which was supposed to have been written by Ezra, and which was considered so sacred, that an anathema was pronounced by the Rabbis at Cairo against every one who should open the door of the chest wherein it was preserved. Marpurgo added that he had intended to take it out, but sickness had prevented him. He also told Wolff of another manuscript of the Law of Moses, *Sepher Torah*, preserved by twelve Jewish families at a place called Malta (not the island), near Cairo, which was supposed to be written a thousand years before, and which was said to have performed many miracles. Many Jews from Cairo and other places performed pilgrimages to that Sepher Torah; and one day afterwards, Wolff asked permission to see it, and was allowed by the Jews to do so, when the worship in the synagogue was over, and most of the congregation had dispersed."—I. 176, 177.

We take as a final extract the admirable advice given by the late Robert Hall to our missionary:

"Before Wolff set out as a missionary, in the year 1821, from England for the East, he had the happiness of becoming acquainted with that mighty genius, the Rev. Robert Hall, the Baptist preacher, who said to him, 'Now, Wolff, you are going out as a missionary to the East; let me, therefore, give you some hints. First of all, do not imagine that wisdom has died out with us Protestants; and that all that you see among the Eastern nations is folly and superstition, because they are not in accordance with your preconceived opinions. On the contrary, direct your attention to the customs and practices of the Eastern churches, and, depend upon it, that those customs, opinions, and practices which are universal are of apostolic origin; for the East is not called, without reason, 'the unchangeable East.' And be not afraid if those customs are also practised by the Papists; for the Papists wear shoes, and the Protestants do so likewise.'

"Wolff could have kissed Robert Hall for this beautiful advice, and it sank deep into his ears and heart."—II. 310.

Robert Hall would indeed have wondered, had he survived, to learn that the first fruits of his advice to Joseph was his observance of the general acceptance in the East of "Apostolic Succession." And thus was he convinced that it is, "in the strictest sense of the words, *a most scriptural doctrine.*"

SOME ACCOUNT OF MR. RICHARD FRANKLAND, THE EMINENT NONCONFORMIST TUTOR.*

The troubles of the Nonconformist in the reigns of Charles and James the Second, were sometimes aggravated by the eccentric and lawless proceedings of the officers of the ecclesiastical courts. These men were often reckless in their treatment of the persons against whom proceedings were taken in their courts, reckoning, and not without reason, on perfect impunity. In one of Oliver Heywood's MS. note-books,† mention is made, under the date May 29, 1681, of certain proceedings of a Church officer at Kendal:

"Mr. Stanford, of Kendal, was to publish an absolution of Mr. Frankland, which was procured by Mrs. Jackson of Mr. Cradock, and instead of reading that, he said this: 'I am to give you notice that Mr. Richard Frankland, the ringleader of the sectarys, hath voluntarily submitted himself to the orders of the Church and is reconciled to it. What his design therein is, I cannot divine, except it be to sue for his scholars' pay to him; but methinks I see him come with bended knees, tears in his eyes, confession in his mouth, that he hath wronged the Church of England, begging pardon, promising reformation, and to be an obedient son of the Church, and resolving to come to the beginning of the service; and if he comes, good people, let him come freely, and do not hinder him. But you will say, 'How know you this?' I answer, 'I know no more of it than you do.'"

This was probably the idle freak of a crazy or a tipsy man; but the report spread that the noted Nonconformist tutor had succumbed and conformed, and the shrewd people of the dales through which the lying rumour ran, conjectured that he had got some good living.

In the year 1682, Oliver Heywood preached the first sermon in "a new-built meeting-place and pulpit" in Craven. Mr. Hunter, in his Life of Oliver Heywood, says: "This must mean the meeting-house at Winterburn, between Settle and Skipton, the only one‡ which arose in Craven under the old Dissent. It was the place which Mrs. Lambert attended." Whether there were one or two Nonconformist churches at that early period in Craven, we may feel assured that Mr. Frankland had much to do with their establishment and support. The fact has been already mentioned of his preaching at Craven through the instrumentality of Mrs. Lambert.

Mr. Frankland was permitted to behold the termination of the bad rule of the Stuart family by the glorious Revolution of 1688,

---

* Concluded from p. 16.

† Recently in the possession of the late Rev. Joseph Hunter, and sold by auction, with other books, MS. and printed.

‡ In the Congregational Year-Book, Horton in Craven is mentioned as having existed from 1670. Both places are near Skipton; Winterburn, seven miles N.W. by N.; the other, ten miles W. by S.

and the accession of William and Mary. But the change did not bring him immunity from legal troubles.

The Act of Toleration, though one of the distinctive trophies of the Revolution, was, as Mr. Hallam has remarked, "a very scanty measure of religious liberty." Mr. Locke, writing to Limborch respecting it, described it as wanting the breadth which Christians free from ambition and prejudice, and lovers of truth, might wish; but he welcomed it as a great gain, and with true political foresight said: "In these beginnings are laid, I hope, those foundations of liberty and peace in which the church of Christ will be finally established." It repealed the laws making it a crime on the part of Nonconformists to abstain from the parish church and to attend a conventicle; it also protected Nonconformist worship from violence and insult; but it did nothing to legalize the right of Nonconformists to educate their youth in their own way and in their own schools. Aided by the silent but effectual power of public opinion, this right was in the course of time indisputably established. But for nearly three quarters of a century the right was questioned, as the history of the academies at Rathmel, Warrington (under Dr. Charles Owen) and at Northampton (under Dr. Doddridge) attests.

Another sufferer from a similar cause was Mr. Oldfield, of Coventry, who was cited into the ecclesiastical courts of Lichfield and Coventry for the crime of teaching academic learning without a licence, and without subscription to the Book of Common Prayer. These harassing proceedings were at length put an end to, after costly litigation, and Mr. Oldfield obtained in Westminster Hall a *noli prosequi*. After detailing this case, Dr. Toulmin, in his History of the Protestant Dissenters (pp. 119, 120), thus speaks of that of Mr. Frankland:

"The learned Mr. Frankland, ejected from Bishop's Aukland, in Durham, who conducted, at different places of residence, an academical seminary of great reputation from 1669 to 1698, was, notwithstanding the protection and security which the Toleration Act offered, harassed by citations from the ecclesiastical courts from the Revolution in 1688 to his death in 1698, soon after he had obtained a similar prohibition to stop proceedings: in the mean time he had been excommunicated, on one of the citations for non-appearance. Others met with trouble on the same ground. The spirit of the law, which indeed, under great limitations, granted liberty of religious profession, and the known dispositions of the court, were not sufficient to restrain the operations of intolerance without an appeal to the royal prerogative, to obtain from the liberality of the king the indemnity which the law ought to have guaranteed. The proceedings against Mr. Oldfield and Mr. Frankland, on account of keeping seminaries for classical and philosophical learning, were peculiarly groundless and illiberal, as both had studied at the universities of Cambridge, and had left that seat of science and literature with great reputation for talents and proficiency. Prosecutions against men for opening schools and diffusing knowledge were more suitable to

the age of Gothic barbarism than to times like those of the Revolution, when the day-star of light and liberty was rising on mankind."

It necessarily strikes us as passing strange that an amiable and accomplished man like Richard Frankland should be harassed by persecuting laws when living in the diocese of Archbishop Sharp (the descendant of persecuted Nonconformists in the same county), and under the primacy of another Yorkshire prelate, Tillotson (also connected with Nonconformists). Yet such was the fact. We learn from Newcome's Life of Archbishop Sharp, that the first difficulties that worthy prelate met with in his diocese arose from "Dissenters taking advantage of the Act of Toleration to break loose and assume greater liberties than were designed them by the Act;" and the editor specifies "their setting up schools and private academies." This language indicates imperfect acquaintance with Nonconformist history.

It would have been somewhat singular if Nonconformist teachers had, after the passing of the Act of Toleration, felt any hesitation in claiming the liberty of educating their youth in their own principles,—a liberty which they had practically vindicated in the tyrannous times of the Stuart kings.

We have some interesting references to the later proceedings against Mr. Frankland, in the correspondence of the two Archbishops, and in a familiar narrative of the affair by the sufferer. They have, we believe, not been made use of in connection with the biography of Mr. Frankland. This is the letter of Archbishop Tillotson:*

"My Lord, "Lambeth House, June 14, 1692.

"Yesterday I received your Grace's letter concerning Mr. Frankland, with the copy of an address to your Grace against him. Yourself are best judge what is fit to be done in the case, because you have the advantage of enquiring into all the circumstances of it. If my advice can signify any thing, it can only be to tell your Grace what I would do in it, as the case appears to me at this distance. I would send for him, and tell him, that I would never do any thing to infringe the Act of Toleration. But I did not think his case came within it; that there are two things in his case which would hinder me from granting him a license, though he were in all things conformable to the Church of England. First, his setting up a school where a *free-school* is already established; and then, his instructing young men in so public a manner in university learning, which is contrary to his oath to do, if he hath taken a degree in either of our universities; and I doubt, contrary to the bishop's oath to grant him a license for doing of it; so that your Grace does not, in this matter, consider him at all as a dissenter. This I only offer to your Grace as what seems to me the fairest and softest way of ridding your hands of this business. . . . . I remain, my Lord, your Grace's very affectionate brother and servant, Jo. Cant."

* First printed in Dr. Birch's judicious Life of Tillotson (p. 271), but given again, and from the original, in Newcome's Life of Archbishop Sharp (pp. 358, 359).

How far the Archbishop of York acted on the advice of the Primate, will appear from the following letter, written by Frankland to Ralph Thoresby, the Leeds antiquary:

"Honoured Sir, "Rathmell, November 6th, 1694.

"Your's of October 17th I received; and though I have delayed writing thus long, yet it is but a little wherein I can well satisfy your request at present, and that especially, as to the altitude of some of our Craven Hills. According to the observations which formerly have been made, and which I find set down, the hill called Pennigent is five hundred and eighty yards perpendicular height above the plains of our Rathmell Ings; and the hill called Ingle-borrow is about the same height; and these two are the highest hills in our country. The hill called Fountain's-fell is about five hundred and sixty yards high; the hills called Pendle-hill, and Hinkel-haw, are not much above five hundred yards high: and though Pendle-hill seem as great an hill as any of them, yet I conceive the reason of its falling so much short in altitude, is from its standing on a falling ground. I might have mentioned some other hills, but these are the most remarkable in our parts.

"As to the conference I had with the present Archbishop, it was at two times: the former was at Skipton, where many of his clergy being present, would gladly have been hearers, but he would not suffer one of them to be in the room with us. I remember he began at first to be somewhat hot, but I was resolved to abate him nothing; he told me that he would not suffer such work to be done, as I was doing.* I told him there was other work much more proper for him, and of far greater importance, to be done by him; he asked me what it was. I told him, that as to the exercise of severity, he should begin at home, with those of his own clergy, many of whom were scandalous, a great reproach to religion, and stood need to be reformed. And for other work, I told him, I judged it much more suitable for him, to endeavour union and agreement amongst good men, though differing somewhat in their notions, than to cause rents in the Church about such poor and trivial things as ceremonies. He granted both; and after, became very moderate, and invited me to come and see him, and we parted friendly. There were other things we did freely discourse upon, but it is so long since, and the particulars so far slipped out of my memory, that I fear I cannot give you a just account of them, and therefore would rather refer you to that letter I writ to Mr. Heywood† about them; only this

* Educating persons for the Dissenting ministry.

† The letter to Oliver Heywood is given by Mr. Hunter in the Thoresby Correspondence, and part of it will be presently quoted. The narrative of the interviews which Mr. Frankland had with Archbishop Sharp contains one or two statements not made to Thoresby; e.g., the Archbishop told Mr. F. that the course he took tended to perpetuate a schism in the Church, and was therefore not sufferable. Mr. F. replied that Conformists were fallible in their judgments, as well as Nonconformists, and therefore he desired permission to argue the case with the Archbishop about schism before he came to a determination about it. Mr. F., speaking of the "other work" the clergy had to do, said it was better to endeavour reconciliation amongst sober Protestants, for strengthening the Protestant interest at a time when it was so much in danger. The Archbishop said he hoped the Nonconformists would find him an honest man. Mr. Frankland replied "that candour and moderation went to make up honesty." This the Archbishop readily granted. Mr. F. rejoined that should the Archbishop not

I well remember, that in general, the Archbishop did much yield to, and comply with what I said.

"The second conference I had with him, was at his own house at Bishop-thorp; where, to answer his invitation and my promise, I waited on him; but he would not at all suffer, that we should enter upon a debate about such things as were in controversy betwixt us, though I did attempt it once or twice: yet he was very courteous; he earnestly pressed me for to dine with him, and would have sent for my daughter, who was at an inn-house; but I, being much straitened in time, did at last prevail for to be excused. But I must view his library, take a pipe of tobacco with him, and drink of some of his wine bottles. And when I took leave with him, he desired me to remember him in prayer. I had at that time some free discourse with him: I told him I had observed the manner of his confirming baptized persons, at Skipton. He asked me what I thought of it; I said, I supposed it was at first intended for admitting baptized persons to the Supper Ordinance, who could give a good account of their knowledge and conversation; he said it was, and that he had given a strict charge to the ministers to bring none before him to be confirmed, but such. I told him that then he was grossly abused by them, because the persons brought before him were generally ignorant, loose, and profane, and little, or no means used for their instruction and reformation: he asked me how I thought this abuse might be remedied; I gave him the best advice I could. He read me that petition against myself,* which several ministers had presented to him; but seemed to give so little regard to it, that he desired to be informed by me concerning them and their walkings, promising to keep secret what I told him. He said I had great friends at London, and that he knew them. There were other things passed betwixt us, which I cannot now relate, nor do I know, at present, where to find the secretary's letter; but it was directed to the former Archbishop. That other work relating to my dear son, I should, above all other things, most willingly have complied with your most kind request in; but when I may have ability, or opportunity for it, I know not. Your nephew is very well; so with dearest respects to yourself and Madam Thoresby, to your mother Sykes, to brother and sister Wilson, I take leave, who am, Sir, your very affectionate friend and servant,

"Richard Frankland.

"Some things I have mentioned to you, which I should not have been free to mention, but that I know to whom I write."

The narrative which this letter gives is honourable alike to the temper and forbearance of the Archbishop and the manliness and self-respect of the Nonconformist tutor.†

exercise moderation, he would frustrate the hopes which many sober people entertained, founded on his well-known character. On this the Archbishop treated Mr. F. very kindly, and asked him to visit him, which Mr. F. partly promised.

* In a letter from the son of Archbishop Sharp to Dr. Birch, now in the British Museum (Birch MSS. 4318, art. 142), and printed in the Camden Society volume of "Original Letters of Eminent Men" (pp. 374—378), this matter is referred to; and it is explained that the formal petition to the Archbishop came from the clergy of Craven, and its prayer was for the suppression of the academy.

† The courtesy of Dr. Sharp to Mr. Frankland was more than imitated by one of the most amiable of his successors, the late venerable Dr. Harcourt, who when-

The goodwill of the Archbishop was not, however, able to protect Mr. Frankland from harassing proceedings in the ecclesiastical and other courts. We get from contemporary diaries and letters a glimpse now and then of these legal troubles. The Rev. Richard Stretton, writing to Thoresby, Feb. 10, 1694, says, "Mr. Frankland's indictment we have gotten quashed yesterday." He had, as Archbishop Sharp told him, some good and powerful friends at court to speak in his behalf. One of these was the good Lord Wharton, who had been one of the lay members of assembly of divines, and was a zealous and kind friend to many of the ejected clergy. Another was Sir Thomas Rokeby.* Perhaps liberal Churchmen like Sharp and Tillotson, compelled by the laws of their Church and the demands of an intolerant clergy to do some violence to their own sense of right, or at the best reduced to the humiliation of a temporizing policy, are entitled to some share of that pity which we more freely give to those who suffer for nobly daring to be true to conscience. It is less difficult to say, such men should quit a Church the intolerance of which they disapprove, than it is to realize the painful nature of the alternative.

Mr. Frankland found time to take part in some of the public proceedings of the Nonconformist ministers in the north of England. In 1691, the first of these gatherings in Yorkshire, since known there and elsewhere by the name of "Meetings of Ministers," was held at Wakefield. Occasion was taken of a lecture preached there at the house of Mrs. Kirby, the widow of one of the ejected clergy, who had been one of the Camden Lecturers. Mr. Frankland was the senior minister present. There were associated with him eight of the ejected clergy of the county (including Mr. Prime, Mr. O. Heywood, Mr. Sharp, Mr. Dawson, &c.), also eleven ordained ministers and four candidates. Great was the excitement and alarm in the quiet town of Wakefield at this invasion of Nonconformity. To avoid observation, the ministers thought it prudent, at the close of the religious service, "to go apart and by several ways to the house at which they dined." Later in the day the ministers assembled in their registered house and formed themselves into a deliberative assembly. Mr. Oliver Heywood, who had been the preacher of the day, seems to have acted as President. The proceedings were opened by prayer by Mr. Frankland; then the President read

---

ever he met the most eminent Nonconformist tutor of his day,—his neighbour, the late Rev. Charles Wellbeloved,—took evident pleasure in his conversation, and paid him marked and most courteous attentions.

* Was this the "excellent Judge Rokeby" connected with the county of York, whom, in 1695, Thoresby saw attending the Nonconformist service at Haberdashers' Hall, where Mr. Stretton (previously of Leeds) preached? Sir Thomas Rokeby was appointed by William III. one of the Judges of the Court of Common Pleas soon after the Revolution. A Thomas Rokeby, perhaps a son of the Judge, was one of Mr. Frankland's pupils.

seriatim the "heads of agreement" which had been adopted as a bond of union by the Presbyterian and Independent ministers of London. Discussion was invited, but, except on the part of Mr. Frankland and Mr. Sharp,* no objections were offered. Thoresby, who was present, thus describes the meeting: "Most (of the heads of agreement) were unanimously assented unto by the brethren of both persuasions; others modestly discussed and explained, and, which I rejoiced to observe, without the least passionate expression. The truly Reverend Mr. Frankland and Mr. Sharp in their arguments shewed abundance of learning as well as piety, and were unanswered even in what was not readily assented to by some juniors about synods and re-ordination." The attendance of Thoresby and of his friend Mr. Samuel Ibbetson shews that laymen were present at these assemblies.

The attempts made after the Revolution to bring the Presbyterians and Independents into joint action were not followed by much practical or enduring success. Even with men in whom there was no apparent diversity of creed, there were opposing tendencies which soon developed themselves. The "agreement" to which the Yorkshire ministers pledged themselves in 1691, was presently dissolved, broken up, Mr. Hunter says, "in consequence of doctrinal differences, most of the Presbyterians beginning at this time to advance even from the diluted Calvinism of Baxter to Arminianism, while the tendency of most of the Independents was towards the Calvinism of the Assembly's Catechism and something more." (Life of O. Heywood, p. 373, note.) Within a few years of the "agreement," angry differences arose among the London ministers respecting Dr. Crisp's ultra-Calvinistic doctrines. The liberal party of the London divines ranged themselves about Dr. Daniel Williams, whose opposition to Antinomian doctrines had drawn down upon him the anger of his more Calvinistic brethren. The strife was viewed with sorrow by good men at a distance. Mr. Frankland joined with his Lancashire brethren in 1696 in an attempt to throw oil upon the troubled waters. At their meeting at Bolton, held April 4th, a letter was agreed to, drawn up by Mr. Thomas Jollie, addressed to Mr. Howe, Mr. Mead and the London ministers generally, recommending and encouraging counsels of peace.

On the subject of the ordination of ministers, Mr. Frankland held decided opinions. He expressed himself in these terms to his friend Mr. Heywood, in a letter bearing date Aug. 9, 1694:

"I am troubled to hear that the persons you mention do upon such weak grounds (so far as I understand them) put off their ordination, especially when grave ministers would not only argue them into their

* Mr. Hunter, in his excellent description of this meeting, speaks of Mr. Frankland as the sole objector; but Thoresby, having been present, is sufficient authority for the addition of the name of the Leeds minister as dissenting from the agreement. (Life of Heywood, pp. 372—376.)

duty, but would likewise contribute their help to them. If they should persist in their present course of preaching without being ordained, it would give great offence, and also open the mouths of those enemies of the truth, whom we have sometimes more sharply reproved for their acting as ministers without a due ministerial call; besides, (as you hint,) they might first, in general, be ordained ministers, and then they might, with better right, order and direct their people: they cannot expect to have the divisions that are amongst the people removed, till Christ's discipline take place amongst them."

It was natural that men who attached the last importance to ordination vows should desire to revive at the earliest period the ordination service. In Yorkshire it was resumed as early as the year 1678, and at the instance of Mr. Frankland. The original design was to ordain Mr. John Issot, who had been for some years a pupil at Natland, and who, having completed the academic term, was united with Mr. Frankland, assisting him both in the academy and the pulpit. Two ministers of older standing, but not hitherto ordained, were at their request ordained with him. The service was conducted with much solemnity at a private house in Craven, and extended over two days. There were present lay friends and ministers and some fellow-students of Mr. Issot. Two of the ministers present preached; then followed the Lord's Supper, of which thirty communicants partook. Mr. Frankland then examined the candidates for ordination in the original text of the Scriptures, in science and theology. Mr. Thorpe, one of the candidates, advocated the Baxterian doctrine of justification, which Mr. Frankland amicably disowned. The difference of opinion did not hinder the ordination. The proceedings of the second day included prayer, an examination of the certificates of the candidates, and an academic thesis syllogistically discussed. The high Presbyterian character of the service appeared in the thesis of Mr. Issot, "That ordination by the hands of lay elders *(seniores vulgŏ vocatos laicos)* is not valid." The same thing also appeared in what passed respecting Mr. Darnton, one of the ordained. He confessed his fault "in having preached twenty years without ordination." After renewed prayer, the candidates gave in their confession of faith. They were then questioned individually on various subjects of faith and discipline. The ordaining ministers being satisfied on these several heads, the imposition of hands followed. "The mode was this: Mr. Issot kneeled down before them; Mr. Frankland prayed; and when he came to the words, 'whom we set apart or appoint,' he having laid on his hands, the other two ministers did the same, and kept them on till Mr. Frankland ceased praying." And so with the other two candidates. The elders then gave the right hand of fellowship. Mr. Heywood again preached, discoursing on the laboriousness of the ministerial life. In the concluding prayer, most earnest petitions

were offered for Mr. Frankland and his scholars. After singing a psalm, this very impressive service was closed by the preacher's uttering the customary words of farewell and blessing.

There was another ordination at Craven in 1680, on St. Bartholomew's-day, in which Mr. Frankland took a leading part, the candidate being Mr. Timothy Hodgson, who was for many years domestic chaplain to Sir John and Lady Hewley. On this occasion a difference of opinion arose between Mr. Jollie and Mr. Frankland, and the former retired and took no part in the service. On a subsequent and similar occasion, these two ministers developed one of the distinctive characteristics of the two parties they represented. Mr. Jollie, as an Independent, desired that the people of the congregation should express their desire of dedicating to God the minister about to be ordained. Mr. Frankland, as a Presbyterian, resisted this as an unwarranted innovation, and carried his point. In reviewing this part of Mr. Frankland's career, it must be remembered that his academic and comparatively recluse mode of life would tend to bind him to the usages and ideas which he had accepted in his youth. The instructions which year by year he gave his pupils in matters of discipline as well as faith, would help to rivet his attachment to the ecclesiastical and doctrinal forms accepted of old by the Presbyterian party.

In doctrinal as in ecclesiastical matters, Mr. Frankland firmly resisted innovation; and the only publication which bears his name was a small theological tract designed to rebuke the "Socinian" heresy, which then in various ways began to trouble all that valued orthodoxy above free inquiry.

It is more easy to explain than to vindicate the sensitive jealousy exhibited by the early Reformers and the first Nonconformists in England in respect to opinions passing beyond the limits of what they regarded as orthodoxy. As they of the Church of Rome threatened the early Protestants with the outbreak of innumerable heresies as the consequence of their denial of the authority of the old Church, so did they of the Church of England foretel similar deviations from the orthodox path among Nonconformists. Luther and Calvin felt themselves embarrassed and weakened in their contest with Rome by the novel opinions of the bolder Protestants, and they felt they did well to be angry with their heretical brother, and to suppress at every cost his heresy. Hence the murderous fire lighted up at Champel, and the dying agony of Servetus. Hence, too, the anger of Frankland and others of the ejected clergy at the outbreak during the latter part of the seventeenth century of Unitarian doctrine.

The theological tournament in which those able champions, South and Sherlock, engaged, attracted general attention to the Unitarian controversy, of which the writers of that party were

not slow to make good use. Among these was, towards the close of 1694, a writer who published "A Letter to the Reverend the Clergy of both Universities concerning the Trinity and the Athanasian Creed; with Reflections on all the late Hypotheses, particularly Dr. W——'s, Dr. S——'s; the Trinity placed in its due Light; the 28 Propositions; the calm Discourse of a Trinity in the Godhead, and the Defence of Dr. Sherlock's Notions. With a short Discourse concerning Mysteries." This forms the third tract in the Third Collection of the Socinian Tracts. In ten chapters, occupying 35 quarto pages of double columns, this able writer discusses the several questions then debated, not only between Unitarians and Trinitarians, but between different members of the orthodox party, contrasting with much lucid statement and close argument the opinions of South and Sherlock, of Wallis and Howe and Fowler. In the opening chapter he argues the impossibility of believing that which is in itself incomprehensible. He illustrates the incomprehensibility of the doctrine of the Trinity by the treatment it has received from the hands of its defenders. There are almost as many Trinities as writers, and their Trinities are mutually contradictory. In the second chapter the writer comments on the theological propositions contained in the Athanasian Creed. Next he discusses the theories of the modal or nominal Trinitarians. In the fourth chapter he reviews Dr. South's defence of the doctrine. In the next he considers the arguments of those who, like Dr. Wallis, Dr. Arthur Bury and other nominalists, follow in the track of Dr. South. Then he shews the essentially tritheistical character of the Trinity of the Realist party. In the remaining chapters he discusses the opinions of Dr. Fowler, Mr. Howe and Dr. Sherlock, concluding with some remarks on Mysteries. "The whole Letter is," in the opinion of the late Rev. Robert Wallace, "one continued chain of sound and close reasoning."

Not so thought Mr. Frankland. He therefore prepared, and in 1697 published, a 4to pamphlet of 54 pp., entitled, "Reflections on a Letter writ by a nameless Author to the Rev. Clergy of both Universities, and on his Bold Reflections on the Trinity," &c.* The letter that follows, and which is preserved in the British Museum Library in its author's massive and characteristic penmanship, relates to this work:

"Rathmell, March 1, 1696-7.

"Rev. and dear Brother,—I now send you my *manuscript;* not a new copy of it as I intended, but rather the former, yet renewed in such

* This little volume is of extreme rarity. No copy of it ever fell under Mr. Hunter's inspection. Its existence was not known to the editor of Oliver Heywood's Works. There is no copy, we believe, in the British Museum, the Bodleian, or Dr. Williams's Library. The copy before us appears to have been submerged in salt water. Possibly a large part of the impression may have been accidentally destroyed.

parts as stood most in need of it; which I thought would be better than to have got it wholly writ over anew, unlesse I had more time for overseeing and correcting it. As it is I wholly commit it to you and to the honest stationer your neighbour, yet humbly requesting of you (which you freely promise) that you will add a Preface to it. That a blessing may attend your endeavours about it, and all your worthy endeavours in the church of God; and that this work of mine, how mean soever in respect of its author; yet as designed in defence of the glory of our great God, Father, Son and Spirit, against a scoffing adversary, may find acceptance, shall be the earnest prayer of your ever-endeared brother and servant in our Lord,

"RICH. FFRANKLAND.

"We all give our dear respects to yourself and all yours."

(Letters of Divines, Vol. II. p. 95).

Oliver Heywood did not disappoint the expectations of his friend, but contributed a Preface of five pages, the tone of which is in perfect accord with the "Reflections" which follow. The spirit of the Preface will astound those who know the writer only by his better works on practical religion. It opens thus:

"Ever since the Divine Oracle sounded the alarum of war between the seed of the woman and serpents brood, Gen. iii. 18, the devil and his agents have spit their poison against our blessed Lord Jesus, the Captain of our salvation."

Then the writer enumerates the heresies which have troubled the Church, and describes the fate of some of their defenders:

"Some of them came to astonishing ends, by the just judgment of God, and some by the sentence of men, as Servetus at Geneva, A.D. 1652. Georgius Blandrata, Petrus Statorius vented pernicious errors in Poland, but the later (latter) dissembled, and was found in his bed with his neck broken."

Here there is a manifest error. Of the three eminent Socinian writers who bore the name of Petrus Statorius, not one dissembled or came to a violent end. Blandrata deserted the cause of the Socinians and sided with their Jesuit opponents. His death had nothing to do with his theology, but was the deed of his nephew and heir, anxious to enjoy his uncle's wealth.

Another extract from the Preface will shew in what estimation Mr. Frankland was held by his friends:

"Its true, the plumb-line of reason is too short to fathom this mystery; but where reason cannot wade, faith must swim, having so good a card and guide in the Holy Ghost. The Trinity of Persons and hypostatical union of Manhood and Godhead in Christ, being so fully revealed in scripture, let us hold them fast, and contend for them as our freehold. This is the attempt and design of the ensuing Treatise, which was put into my hands by a very reverend and dear brother, whose praise is in the gospel, who is better known to the world by the successful fruits of his indefatigable labours, sounding vivâ voce, than by legible characters in scripture, having spent much time and strength in his peculiar province, with much advantage to the church of God. His learning and

capacity elevates him above his fellows, so that he needs no epistle of commendation from me or any other person; his own works praise him in the gate and in the consciences of many; nor doth any (pruritus scripturiendi) itch of appearing in print prompt him to this undertaking, but purely a zeal for God, his cause, truth and glory, and the preventing of young students being poisoned with soul-destructive errors, that have edged his upright soul, and moved his able hand to this uncouth undertaking. Its true, the manner of handling this subject is something abstruse and intricate, for the subject is high and profound, and above the reach of ordinary capacities; but I hope it may give some satisfaction to the learned and ingenuous reader, and that this and all the helps polemical and practical may be of use to the Church, is the prayer of thy soul friend,

"March 11, 1697." "O. H."

Mr. Frankland's description of the author of the "Letter" as "a scoffing adversary" is not justified by the work itself, which, like most of the Socinian tracts of that period, is calm and argumentative. The Letter-writer, however, differs from most of the other Socinian authors of his time by the philosophical rather than the scriptural character of his remarks. To a mind like Mr. Frankland's, firmly rooted in the orthodox faith, any questioning of that faith would be painful, and the application of natural reasoning to dogmas which he regarded as transcending reason would wear the aspect of scoffing.

The "Reflections" are from first to last harsh and intolerant. Mr. Frankland evidently regarded his opponent as entitled to neither courtesy nor mercy. He treats his strongest arguments with contempt, and gives an unhesitating contradiction to the plainest statements of the Letter. It need not surprise us that he treats the text of the Heavenly Witnesses (1 John v. 7) as genuine scripture and as settling the question in dispute; but from a professor of theology writing as far back as 1697, it was not to be expected that the Creed "Quicunque Vult," &c., should be spoken of as the work of "the worthy Athanasius." Mr. Frankland admits that Dr. Sherlock and the party of real Trinitarians who assert that the Persons in the Trinity are three distinct Minds or Spirits and three individual Substances, "have given just occasion of offence and scandal to all sober Christians, who do not stand in need of such weapons for defence of the Trinity against the extreams, either of Arius on the one hand, or of Sabellius or the Unitarians on the other." He professes his acquiescence in the Oxford decree of Nov. 25, 1695, censuring Dr. Sherlock's propositions. It would not, however, be an easy task to reconcile this statement with many of the arguments used by Mr. Frankland: e.g., he asserts that "there is not any writer about the Holy Trinity worthy to be taken notice of, but he does acknowledge a Divine Person to be an uncreate, eternal, incomprehensible, almighty Being, yea, God blessed for ever; and that it would be idolatry to worship him if he were not such"

(p. 5); and after quoting Phil. ii. 6, as a proof of the equality of the Son with the Father, he adds, "Ideas of Equals must be equal." So large a portion of Mr. Frankland's Reflections is occupied with verbal criticism on the Letter, that it is difficult to select passages interesting and intelligible apart from those they design to confute. One or two short extracts from the concluding pages must therefore suffice. Mr. Frankland is noticing the Letter-writer's remarks on "Mystery:"

"It argues intolerable pride and folly in him to prefer reason, as in fall'n man, his own magnifyed ideas (of things which we have found already to be so false), to the most undoubted traditions and revelations of God in the world, and to make those the rule and touchstone for trying these by, as its clear he doth, § 11."

"It argues the highest impudence and impiety for him to make, as § 103, 104, Mystery no mark of Christ or true religion, but only of Antichrist and irreligion, when yet sacred scripture tells him, 1 Tim. iii. 16, that *great is the mystery of godliness, God manifest in the flesh*, which clearly shews that there's as well a mystery of godliness relating to Christ as a mystery of iniquity relating to Antichrist."

"He pretends that there is no mystery in religion as to the things themselves which are revealed, but only as to the manner of them. . . . He tells us that to say three persons and one person are the same God, is as great a contradiction as to say, three persons and one are the same, and that we may as soon apprehend a round square, or a mountain without a valley; while yet Trinitarians would maintain under pretence of mystery, and this when not only Unitarians, but all mankind that worship but one Divine Being, are greatly scandalized at them for it, § 22."

"The whole of what is here objected, hath in the preceding discourse been so fully answered; the definitions of Person in general and of Divine Person so clearly laid down; the difference there is betwixt Substance, substantial Essence and Person, so fully cleared; his pretended contradictions, not resulting from Trinitarian doctrine (as he would have it), but from his own false ideas about these things, so clearly refuted and confuted, that I would persuade myself, would he and his party betake themselves to an impartial and unprejudiced consideration of what hath been said, this if it had no further effect, yet would make both him and them for ever hereafter to desist from these their loud and lying clamours against Christ's church and faithful servants, &c."—P. 55.

What Mr. Frankland calls "clearly laid-down definitions" of Person, Substance, &c., are, if not contradictions in terms, to the last degree obscure and perplexing. They who have spent any time and thought on the Homo-ousian controversy, will be able to realize the character of this portion of Mr. Frankland's tract. That he should not have succeeded in making subtle theological distinctions intelligible is not peculiar to him, and too many authorities will be found in every age to countenance the contemptuous and abusive tone he adopts towards his opponent; but it ought to be matter of regret that a Christian scholar

should forget courtesy, and that men like Mr. Heywood and Mr. Frankland, who had tasted the bitterness of persecution, should by their words or their spirit seem to countenance the use of any weapons but those of reason and scripture.

It must not be supposed that in his want of charity towards Unitarians Mr. Frankland and his friend stood alone. Their least tolerant sentiments would have found many echoes from the pastors and people of the early Nonconformist churches. True ideas of religious liberty have always been of slow growth. The results of the long persecution through which the Nonconformists of England had to pass, were more visible in the eighteenth than in the seventeenth century. It is the more necessary to state the truth on this subject, because at the present time a feeling of enthusiasm, in itself natural and commendable, is in many quarters felt towards the ejected clergy, and a disposition has appeared to attribute to them a larger tolerance and a more liberal spirit than really belonged to them. It required the experience and the thoughtfulness of some generations before the conclusions to be drawn from their fidelity to conscience, and the wrongs which they endured on account of their love of what they believed to be truth, were generally recognized, if indeed they are yet generally recognized.

Before bringing this account of Mr. Frankland's life to a close, it is necessary to say something more on the great work of his life, his academy. The words quoted from Oliver Heywood shew the high estimation in which his brethren held his academic labours. He trained a large number of ministers, on whom devolved the responsibility of sustaining during the next forty years the Nonconformity of the principal churches of the north of England. We can enumerate only a few names of the ministers who received their training at Rathmel, Natland, &c.: Mr. Thomas Whittaker, of Leeds; Mr. Timothy Jollie, of Sheffield; Mr. Colton, afterwards Dr. Colton; Mr. Irlam, of Congleton; Mr. Dawson, of Rochdale; Mr. John Ash, of Ashford; Mr. Thomas Dickenson, of Northowram; Mr. John Heywood, minister of Blackley; Mr. Isaac Worthington, of Durham; Mr. John Holland, of Swaledale; Mr. Basnet, of Liverpool; Mr. Robert Murray, assistant minister at Chester; Mr. Jas. Clegg; Mr. Lessingham, of Grantham; Mr. Richard Chorley.

We have in the Life of Oliver Heywood now and then an interesting glimpse at the great Nonconformist academy. Thus in the year 1682, Mr. H., accompanied by his neighbour and friend Mr. Jonathan Priestley, visited Natland. On the day after they arrived, the pupils (about twenty in number) were assembled, and Mr. Heywood delivered an address founded on 2 Chron. xxix. 11, "My sons, be not now negligent; for the Lord hath chosen you to stand before him to serve him, and that you should minister unto him and burn incense." A text more

appropriate to the circumstances of his hearers he could not have selected. On the following day, he spent several hours in intercourse with the young men. Conversation was diversified by prayer. The next day was Sunday, and a great congregation gathered together, from Kendal and other places we may suppose, and Mr. Heywood preached. In those days of persecution, a religious service by a preacher like Oliver Heywood was regarded as a time of refreshment. There were no listless hearers there. The service, we are told, lasted five hours. In the work of the Academy and the duties of the pulpit, Mr. Frankland was assisted by Mr. Issot, by Mr. Owen, and by his own son, John Frankland. The death of his son in early life was a heavy blow, and occasioned the breaking up of the academy on the death of its founder. There was some effort made for its continuance, and Mr. Tong, the Presbyterian minister of Coventry, was named as Mr. Frankland's probable successor; but the scheme failed, and, as a substitute for the institution at Rathmel, Mr. John Chorlton, one of the ministers of Cross-Street chapel, Manchester, opened an academy in that town.

We have one letter more of Mr. Frankland's, which is preserved in the Library of the British Museum (Letters of Divines, II. 95):

"Oct. 22, '97.

"Rev. and dear Brother,—Your comfortable letter, together with your little book (which treating on a subject so suitable for me, renders it very precious to me), I have received, and do heartily thank you for them both. And now in answer to the queries you propose, I say, 1, In reference to the state of my body, I have been afflicted with gravel and wind, caused chiefly, as I suppose, through bad digestion, for most part of a year, and which do yet continue and are (especially at some times) very painful and troublesome. What the Lord designs to do by theise, as whether by means of them more speedily to cut off the thread of a poor toilsome afflicted life, or whether onely to try me for a season, and ith' mean time to inable poor nature not onely to wrastle with them, but to get from under them at length, for my part I cannot yet see. But this I am sure of, the Providence is an awakening Providence, and question not but is designed by a gratious, wise Father for blessed ends, even to bring my great change more nearly within view and to p'pare me for it. And its not the least comfort to me that I am sure to be helped in this with your prayers. As to your 2nd, What I have done about the Sp. Court, I can now inform you. On Tuesday last I had a letter from Mr. Squire my proctor, which certifys that at the last Mich. Court my case was put off by the Chancellor himself, till the Thursday after Andrew day, the last day of the term, so thinks they intend no further proceeding. And he conceives this was by order of the Archbishop. I have in this new experience of God's kindnesse to me, and desire that as this and the like mercies have been bestowed through the prayers of many, so thanks may be given by many on my behalf. As to the 3rd, What your little kinsman doth, I must say, he studies hard and makes good improvement. As to your last, I have received nothing

for him yet from my Lord's executors, but have procured for him (about) three pounds ith' half year or (about) £6 a year, which I hope will be continued for his time. But I suppose it may be Xtmas at soonest before we receive the first half year, and then we shall endeavour to let you know more exactly what it comes to: I will use my best endeavour to procure more for him. As to your school, I fear I can do you little service. Here's an honest man's son, one Shaw, who would be glad of such employment. But I fear he will be too soft and bashful, and if you have scholars forward in learning, I doubt he may be short in point of sufficiency. Yet if for want of one more able you be minded to make tryal of him, upon the least hint from you we shall send him. So with our dear respects and service to yourself, wife and sons, I take leave, who am your very dear brother and servant,

"Ri. ffrankland.

"For the Rev. Mr. Oliver Heywood, at Northowram,
nigh Halifax."

From this letter we learn that Mr. Frankland's persecutors harassed him to the very close of his life. But he was now rapidly hastening to that place *where the wicked cease from troubling*. He sunk to rest, October 1, 1698, being then 68 years of age. Among the pupils who surrounded his death-bed, and who sincerely mourned his departure, was Mr. James Clegg, afterwards Dr. Clegg, who followed the united calling of a minister of the gospel and a physician on the borders of Cheshire and Derbyshire. He thus speaks of the death of his tutor:

"I can never forget the manner and frame in which he left the world, being one of the numerous and sorrowful flock that then stood about his bed. His last breath was spent in taking leave of us, and most solemnly and affectionately recommending us to the favour of God and to the conduct of the great Shepherd." (Life of Mr. Ashe.)

The burial-place of this good man is unknown to us. The funeral sermon was preached by Mr. Chorlton, of Manchester (his text being Matt. xxviii. 20), to an assembly composed of persons of different persuasions, but all concurring in respect and affection to a departed friend. It was matter of regret at the time and afterwards that Mr. Chorlton did not publish the sermon. In the absence of any delineation of his friend's character, we must again refer to Dr. Clegg:

"I never knew a tutor so entirely belov'd by them all, nor one that so well deserv'd it. His unaffected gravity, sweetened with candour, meekness and humility, procur'd him that esteem and veneration, even from the most licentious, that made them ever afraid of grieving or offending him. Very few, indeed, of any persuasion, convers'd with him, but they respected and valued him; for he was a man of great moderation, of a truly charitable disposition, and studious to do good in all relations."

Dr. Calamy (Acct. II. 287) commends Mr. Frankland as a skilful interpreter of scripture and an acute metaphysician. He further describes him as humble in disposition, affable in man-

ners, and liberal to the poor. He also ascribes to him much zeal in promoting the gospel. As a preacher, he speaks of him as solid rather than popular.

A portrait of Mr. Frankland is preserved in Dr. Williams's Library, Redcross Street, London. The features are regular, the eyes large and expressive, and the nose well developed of the Roman kind. The general expression is grave even to melancholy. As a work of art it is valueless, and the portraiture is perhaps not to be absolutely relied on.

Note.—In a former article (see p. 6) it was stated that Bishop Cosin erected on the site of the mansion built by Sir Arthur Haslerigg, the elegant chapel which continues to this day. Since penning this statement, the writer has had the opportunity of reading the Rev. James Raine's "Historical Account of the Episcopal Castle or Palace of Auckland," and from it he learns that the story, though resting on apparently good authority (including a statement by the Bishop himself, and one by Basire, who preached his funeral sermon), is altogether inaccurate. The chapel "in its great leading characteristics is essentially in the same state in which it was left by Bishop Beck in 1310." Some repairs and additions were made by Cosin; but Mr. Raine proves by original documents that what the Bishop did was but "little," and that little was executed in "bad taste." The "apparently most explicit statements" of the Bishop, contradicted as they are by the chapel itself, may illustrate the exaggerations current among the Royalists of 1660 and their successors, when speaking of the "ravenous sacrilege" imputed to Cromwell and his party.

DR. ROWLAND WILLIAMS IN THE COURT OF ARCHES.

The deprivation of Mr. Heath, on which we commented in the last No. of the C. R., seemed to us, as judges *ab extra*, a very paltry proceeding, unworthy of the dignity even of an orthodox Bishop to promote and of an Ecclesiastical Court to enforce. To have run down an exemplary country clergyman of simple, studious, scripture-loving habits, whose resulting mosaic-work of doctrine, if it cannot be squared with Church-of-England orthodoxy, is as little capable of being referred to any known type of heterodoxy, is not an achievement calculated to throw renown over its promoters at all parallel to the grievance which it inflicts upon its object.

There is something less paltry, at any rate, in hunting down a Rowland Williams. That element of the ludicrous which one is apt to see when forty or fifty well-mounted red-coats with a pack of hounds in full cry succeed at last in capturing a hare, is quite absent in a lion hunt. Rowland Williams is no ignoble game. He represents great scholarly and scientific principles, respecting which it is well that a decision should be made (if authority exists to make it clearly and definitively) as to whether they are, or are not, admissible within the pale of the Church of England. He is well able to sustain the position he has taken;

and if his position is defensible in law, he is not the man to be scared from it.

It is as one of the authors of the *Essays and Reviews* that he is cited before the Court of Arches by the Bishop of Salisbury, who stands to him in the relation of Diocesan to the Vicar of Broad Chalke, Wilts. There is something whimsical in this illustration of ecclesiastical discipline. It is not alleged that any one of the 800 rural inhabitants of the hitherto unknown hamlet of Broad Chalke has suffered spiritual damage from the review of Bunsen. It is even doubtful whether the book has penetrated the Wiltshire chalk wolds to this day. Its vicar is non-resident the chief part of the year; his sphere of theological activity being Llampeter College in South Wales. It is there, if anywhere, that, as Professor in a College for training young clergymen, his free thought and learning are dangerous. But there, no episcopal authority can touch him. The Bishop of St. David's, as official Visitor of the Llampeter College, has blandly suggested to him to resign his professorship; but the Professor, in reply to that gentle impeachment, politely hinted that the Visitor's wishes had not the force of law. So discipline is invoked from another quarter. It may be possible for the Bishop of Salisbury to deprive the vicar of Broad Chalke, who is as innocent as a non-resident can be of corrupting the orthodoxy of his parishioners Hodge and Ditcher, though the Bishop of St. David's is helpless on behalf of the embryo clergy at Llampeter, and Convocation itself can only denounce the Essays on behalf of this orthodox nation in general.

The pleadings in the case being now completed, though judgment is not expected to be pronounced till May or June, we take occasion in the interval to remark upon the more striking features of the accusation and defence; and, without presuming to offer legal opinion or anticipate the legal decision, we shall endeavour to estimate the case in the *moral* court ecclesiastical.

The articles filed against Dr. Rowland Williams are twenty-two in number. The first declares that all persons in holy orders ought to adhere to and maintain with constancy and sincerity the doctrines and teaching of the Church, and that impugners of them ought to be punished and corrected. Articles 2 to 6 are technical. From 7 to 16 specify the heresies charged against him, and quote numerous passages from his review of Bunsen's Biblical Researches in support of the charges. Among these are most of the passages cited in Dr. Jelf's pamphlet against the essayists. The free historical examination of the Hebrew prophecies which (with Dr. Williams as with most critics) results in assigning the fulfilment of many of them to occasions less distant from the prophet than the days of Christianity,—the doubt whether Daniel can have been the author of the *book*

Daniel, or Jonah of the *book* Jonah, and whether those books of the New Testament which Eusebius noted as of disputed authorship were really written by their alleged authors,—a suggested spiritual idea of the incarnation and of baptism, and an implied hint that justification properly means the peace of mind or sense of Divine approval which comes from trust in a righteous God; —these are the chief results of critical and interpretive learning that are specified as heresies in this suit. But a 17th article deals in more general terms, and, conveniently leaving the troublesome office of specific quotation, indicts the whole essay in the round accusations following:

"And we further object to you, the said Rowland Williams, that the manifest tendency, scope, object and design of the whole essay is to inculcate a disbelief in the divine inspiration and authority of the Holy Scriptures contained in the Old and New Testament, to reduce the said Holy Scriptures to the level of a mere human composition, such as the writings of Luther and of Milton; to deny that the Old Testament contains prophecies or predictions of our Saviour and other persons and other events; to deny that the prophets preaching under the special inspiration of the Holy Spirit foretold human events; to deny altogether or greatly discredit the truth and genuineness of the historical portions of the Old Testament, and the truth and genuineness of certain parts of the New Testament, and the truth and reality of the miracles recorded as facts in the Old and New Testament; to deny or interpret by a meaning at variance with that of the Church the doctrines of original sin, of infant baptism, of justification by faith, atonement and propitiation by the death of our Saviour, and of the incarnation of our Saviour."

Such, in brief, is the sum of the accusations against the author of the review of Bunsen. To intelligent readers of that review it will probably occur, that the specific criticisms complained of are, for the most part, strongly sustained by biblical and historical facts, which would remain facts in spite of a decree of the Court of Arches; and that the more general accusations following are without foundation in the tone and spirit of the essay, and sound more like the peroration of an opposing counsel who has no case, than the words of an official indictment.

The Church formularies alleged to be sinned against are the 6th, 7th and 20th, the 2nd, 11th and 27th of the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion, that portion of the Nicene Creed which declares that the Holy Ghost spoke by the Prophets, the first chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews as appointed to be read on Christmas-day, and certain other chapters for other days.

The charges founded upon the lessons for certain days are objected to as informal by Dr. Williams's counsel, and must surely be struck out by the Judge, who has already declared that "he hoped it would be understood that he was not to try those grave questions in divinity." The question has evidently to do with the Church articles and formularies, and not with the Scriptures except as overridden by those articles and formularies. That a

certain chapter of the Bible is ordered to be read on a certain day, does not define the interpretation to be put upon that chapter.

The 6th of the Church Articles *(Of the Sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures for Salvation)* contains the Church of England's enumeration of canonical scriptures,—than which it is impossible to imagine anything more slovenly and unprecise as a legal instrument furnishing the basis of an ecclesiastical law-suit. It professes to give the *names and number of the canonical books*, "*of whose authority was never any doubt in the Church.*" In this list, the books of the Prophets are none of them mentioned by name, but the Churchman is to accept *four Prophets the greater* and *twelve Prophets the less.* Some of those who doubt the authorship of Daniel and Jonah have thought it reasonable to accept sixteen, if not seventeen, Prophets besides them, counting a second Isaiah, and a second if not also a third Zechariah, though not presuming to be quite sure that those were their real names. They may still receive four Prophets the greater (the longest books) and twelve or thirteen the less. The Church list of canonical scriptures goes on to enumerate all the books of the Jewish Apocrypha as books which "the Church doth read for example of life and instruction of manners, but yet it doth not apply them to establish any doctrine."

If this is but a vague and unsatisfactory statement of what is canonical in the Old Testament, much more so is the definition of what is canonical in the New: "*All the books of the New Testament, as they are commonly received, we do receive and account them canonical.*" No list even of their titles is given; but assuming the list to be understood, it is simply untrue to affirm that they are all books "of whose authority was never any doubt in the Church." Eusebius's catalogues of undisputed and disputed books are older than the Articles of the Church of England; and even if that Church stupidly requires her clergy now to believe them all alike authentic, she is rather hard upon them in requiring them to insist that *nobody ever has doubted any of them.* Facts cannot be obliterated even by Articles of Religion authorized by Act of Parliament. If Dr. Lushington considers this most undiscriminating and unlearned Article as furnishing the very letter of the ecclesiastical law by which he must decide, and is quite certain that Daniel is one of the "four Prophets the greater" and Jonah one of the "twelve Prophets the less," and that the Article which names neither of them still implies that Daniel wrote the book of Daniel and Jonah the book of Jonah,—and if he is quite clear that what is said of the books of the New Testament includes the opinion that the Epistle to the Hebrews was written by St. Paul, and that 2 Peter is undoubtedly the genuine work of the apostle Peter,—then woe to Dr. Rowland Williams, and woe to scholars and scholarship in the Church of

England. Common sense and common justice must not be so outraged.

How the 7th Article of the Church (intitled, *Of the Old Testament)* is called in question by Dr. Williams's essay, is not very manifest, unless he is considered to be one of those "not to be heard, which feign that the old Fathers did look only for transitory promises." But we doubt whether the accused has absolutely put the important word *only* into his illustrations of the unquestionable fact that the old Fathers did look earnestly and chiefly for such promises. Article 2 teaches the Incarnation grossly enough; 11 is on Justification, and 27 on Baptism,—on all which points Dr. Williams is called to account.

The 20th Article is on *The Authority of the Church;* and it seems somewhat superfluous to charge him with impugning that Article when the Church is engaged in trying her authority against him. In civil cases it is not customary to lay the indictment in this manner. A man is not charged with theft, and *also* with having defied the authority of King, Lords and Commons. He is not accused of murder, and *also* of being liable to its penalty. But the ecclesiastical indictment is more full, if not more precise. It charges the heretic with having impugned the doctrinal and critical assertions of various authoritative Articles, and *also* with having impugned that Article which declares the Church's authority over him. Thus assurance is made doubly sure, no doubt.

Let us now see what is the line of defence adopted. Lines of defence, we ought rather to say; for Dr. Deane and Mr. Fitzjames Stephen, the advocates of Dr. W., have adopted two different and independent, but not inconsistent, lines of argument.

It had been rumoured that the defence would chiefly consist in an attempt to distinguish between Bunsen's views as expounded by Dr. Williams, and Dr. Williams's own views as not expressed but improperly identified with Bunsen's. But this would have been a vain attempt for the adroitest lawyer to risk, and an unmanly course for the defendant to have allowed. So evident throughout is the general sympathy of the reviewer with the opinions he reviews, and so express are his words of admiring assent at the end: "Those who have assailed his (Bunsen's) doubtful points are equally opposed to his strong ones. Our own testimony is, where we have been best able to follow him, we have generally found most reason to agree with him." There was no honourable retreat from this plain avowal.

Dr. Deane accordingly, the leading counsel for the defence, only hints, as in passing, that "he had yet to learn that it was an offence against the law for clergymen to review the work of a learned man and comment upon it." He said, "It was no part of his instructions, nor was it his duty, to shrink from the most thorough inquiry into all the passages cited. He would not

adopt any legal subterfuge in dealing with them. He was not sent there to explain away or conceal the opinions of the defendant." Mr. Stephen was yet more explicit in saying, "that Dr. Williams did not wish to shelter himself under the honoured name of Baron Bunsen, whose works he had reviewed, and for which he was now charged with heresy. The views expressed in the obnoxious essay were his own, and on the part of the Rev. gentleman he stated that he was prepared to take the full responsibility of it." There was therefore no room for Dr. Phillimore's insinuation, afterwards made, that the defendant wished to be regarded as only recapitulating Bunsen's views without adopting them. It was irrelevant, unhandsome and unprofessional.

To return to Dr. Deane. He complained, and justly, of the mode in which the articles of accusation were framed, by quoting passages apart from their context, mixing passages from different parts of the essay, and suggesting meanings not necessarily implied. He quoted Bishop Lowth's Preliminary Dissertation to his New Translation of Isaiah as proof that the interpretation (as well as the translation) of the prophets might be regarded as an open question. As such certainly Lowth treated it, though his interpretive conclusions were far from anticipating those of Bunsen. This allusion to Lowth has given great offence to (we presume) some very orthodox descendant of the Bishop, who writes to the *Times* (Dec. 27) from the Athenæum Club, signing G. T. Lowth, and vouching for the orthodoxy of the Bishop, which, so far as we know, has never been impugned. He has been appealed to in this cause only as an authority for the scholarly *method*, which had not, however, led him far astray from traditional doctrinal results. Dr. Deane appealed also to other well-known divines of the Church of England in justification of the right to be scholars and to apply their scholarship to the interpretation of the Scriptures; referring especially to *Hey's Lectures on Divinity*, which discuss the question of Inspiration; to *Warburton*, who talks contemptuously of "organic inspiration," and is unorthodox enough in his *Divine Legation of Moses;* and to *Hartwell Horne's Introduction*, which contains a summary of opinions on the subject.

When the Judge pointedly asked Dr. Deane whether he was to understand him to say that Dr. Williams had never denied the two senses of prophecy, we can hardly acquit the latter of "legal subterfuge" in his reply, that "Dr. Williams never denied prophecy in its fulfilment—that is, in its secondary sense." Every theologian knows that the double-sense theory of prophecy takes Isaiah (for instance) to speak consciously of Judah and Israel, of Babylon and the Restoration, in the primary sense of his words, and consciously of Christ and Christianity in their secondary sense. Bunsen held nothing like this, nor (we presume) does Rowland Williams. We hold (as we suppose with them both)

that those prophecies which the Jews spoke and understood of the expected temporal Messiah's kingdom have been better realized in the spiritual work of Christ. But we could not allow Dr. Deane to say we accepted the double sense of prophecy, which seems like making it into equivocation or nonsense. Dr. Deane shewed by New-Testament instances that prophecy was often *applied*, by way of illustration, to things which it could not be seriously maintained to have originally contemplated. But this is not accepting the double sense as originally contemplated by the prophet. Dr. Deane further shewed in detail that many clergymen had already avowed the very opinions now charged as heretical against his client, and urged that, "if the promoters were right in their views, there must necessarily be an end to literary criticism in the Church of England."

Mr. Fitzjames Stephen, the second counsel for the defendant, took a bolder line of argument, which, if it be tenable, will prove the Church of England to be truly liberal, philosophical, literary, critical and free to the fullest extent; and, when thoroughly recognized, will surely supersede the functions of the Court of Arches thenceforth. Under such a Church there can be no prosecutions for heresy:

"If this had been an ordinary case he should, he said, have occupied a subordinate position only; but, considering the importance of the issue involved, the counsel for Dr. Williams had thought it better to pursue their independent courses, and to lay their conclusions independently before the court. The real issue involved in this case was this: *Did the law of England forbid the clergy of the Church of England to exercise their minds in the interpretation of Scripture?* The first question in every case of this kind must be:—'What is the law under which the defendant is to be tried, and what the principle upon which the Judge is to regulate his decision?' The Judge of that court was not sitting as a divine to decide upon the truth of Dr. Williams's opinions, but would have to consider only whether the defendant was forbidden by law to entertain those opinions under penalty of deprivation of his living of Broad Chalke. The ground upon which he intended to argue this case was that, in ecclesiastical courts, *open questions were permitted, and that, upon questions which had not been decided, full and intire liberty was left to the Church.* That which was contained in the Articles was conclusive, and though the rubrics and formularies of the Church were also conclusive, greater distinctness and precision was required in them than in the Articles. If there were any ambiguity in the formularies, it was not to be understood that the Church meant by them to establish indirectly that which it did not establish directly by the Articles of faith. * * * His client would, he was sure, sooner lose his living than gain his cause upon a technicality of law, or by the sacrifice of his convictions. He took, therefore, the bolder course, and contended that if Dr. Williams had entertained unfamiliar opinions—opinions which startled many people and some divines—he had a right to entertain those opinions, because he had from the Church, according to his ordination vow, the right and duty to follow studies profitable for the understanding of the

Holy Scriptures. That the Bible was the law of the Church, and contained all things necessary to salvation, was no ground for asserting that everything contained in the Bible was literally true, and this prosecution was an attempt to impose dogmas upon the Church which the Church itself did not impose. There was a great difference between unfeigned belief in the canonical Scriptures as declared in the ordination service, and unfeigned belief in every word of the Authorized Version. The liberty of interpreting scripture according to private judgment was allowed in the writings of every divine of the Church, and he was convinced that, so far from lessening the authority of the Bible, free criticism would do more than anything else to remove the doubts thrown upon it by the discoveries of science and the comments of learned men. *The questions of inspiration and interpretation were left open by the Articles;* and having regard to the controversies at the time of the Reformation, he contended that this was no accidental omission, but that the Articles were as carefully and advisedly framed as any legal document."

Is it true, then, that "the questions of inspiration and interpretation" were left open by the Articles of the Church of England, and purposely so left?

Would that it had been really so! Thirty-nine Articles and three Creeds and many doctrinal Confessions and Doxologies might then have been spared, which have excited discord and bigotry ever since. But in a modified sense we admit that the Church of England allows considerable latitude on these two comprehensive subjects. There is little or nothing in her Articles to define what must be understood by inspiration, or to regulate the work of criticism and interpretation. We can only conclude that her clergy are free to think, to criticise and to interpret, *until* their results impugn some or other of the fixed points of doctrine laid down in the formularies of the Church. We do not see that Rowland Williams was forbidden to be a student and a divine. He was not forbidden to read Bunsen or any other book. He was not forbidden to learn what he could about the literary questions respecting Jonah, Daniel, the prophecies in general, the Epistle to the Hebrews, &c.; nor to avow any of his learned results. But he must take the chance of running his learned head against any of those posts called Articles (or Articles that we should call posts) which have defined and shut up for ever the absolute truth of God. It is as subject to this risk that the Church-of-England clergyman is free to pursue his inquiries and avow his results in the wide field of sacred learning. On the technical question of inspiration, the Articles are so little explicit, that we doubt whether Dr. Lushington could define what the orthodox opinion is. On the subject of sacred criticism, they say very little, and that little (in Articles 6 and 7) defective or false. But on biblical interpretation, while they lay down no principles or rules whatever (except the impossible one that the Church may not "so expound one place of scripture that it be repugnant to another"), they distinctly warn every

free inquirer that he must come to the doctrinal conclusions of the Articles and Creeds, on pain of deprivation in the Ecclesiastical Courts and of perishing everlastingly! Such is the limitation with which we accept Mr. Fitzjames Stephen's assertion that matters of interpretation are purposely left open to individual judgment. It is a serious limitation to scholarship and to conscience. The results of theological inquiry are barred by the Articles and Creeds, but the process is, with this limitation, left open. If we are right in this view of the formularies of the Church of England, heresy can hardly be proved against Dr. W. from his implied views of prophecy, still less from his modes of biblical criticism and interpretation, which the Church has not forbidden *in limine;* but the heresy, if proved at all, will be found in his avowed doctrinal *results.* Do the Articles on the Incarnation, on Justification or on Baptism, condemn his *results?* This seems to us the question on which the Judge ought, according to the principle of subscription to doctrinal Articles, to decide. Yet it is plain that the current orthodoxy of the day has been infinitely more shocked and offended by "the free handling" of scriptural subjects, and the application of such knowledge and science to them as must soon forbid "the repetition of conventional language and traditional methods of treatment,"* than it has been by the more specific heresies discoverable in interpretations adopted by the defendant.

Mr. Stephen's speech contained several other noteworthy passages, which at least describe what *ought* to be the spirit of a National Church of England, though they should be shewn by the judgment in the present case to be somewhat in advance of its actual constitution and administration. In the following words he hit the true distinction between *Bibliolatry* and Bible-scholarship, which goes to the root of this prosecution:

"Two views were possible with respect to the Bible. All Christians must believe that God had made a revelation to man, which consisted in part in precepts to be obeyed, and in part of doctrines to be believed. But while some Protestants believed that the Bible *contained* that revelation, others believed that it *constituted* it. Some believed that the aggregate of the doctrines bequeathed (?) by God to man was the proper object of belief, and the proper subject of divine authority, while others believed that the Bible itself constituted Christianity, and that every word it contained was of equal and absolute authority. He desired the distinction to be observed."

How little is this self-evident distinction observed! The advocate himself, in laying it down, feels it necessary to apologise to the religious ignorance and bigotry that disregard it habitually:

"He knew the risk he ran of being held up as a man who disbelieved

---

* Pref. to *Essays and Reviews.*

in the choicest gift of God to man, but he would not shrink from performing his duty to his client, and, however plainly he might speak, he entertained the deepest reverence for the Holy Scriptures."

It is only by such plain speaking on the palpable but neglected distinction between the Scriptures as the records of Revelation and the Scriptures as absurdly alleged to be in every word Revelation itself, that reverence for them can be maintained or promoted. We do not know anything in the Church Articles that either recognizes or ignores this distinction; but the common sentiments of Churchmen decidedly ignore it, and the assumption that the Bible *constitutes* Revelation is certainly at the bottom of the articles filed against Dr. Williams.

Mr. Stephen made a good point by contrasting the articles and formularies of the Church of England with those of the Westminster Confession of Faith, and certainly shewed that, *compared* with the Presbyterian Church of Scotland, it allows, and meant in fixing its Articles to allow, considerable diversity of opinion. But the Articles remain, beyond which no latitude was to be allowed; and by them the defendant must stand or fall.

He thus eloquently presses upon the Judge the duty of interpreting the law with the utmost freedom in the defendant's behalf, and of leaving to the Legislature the odium of passing a law that all who enter the Church "shall leave thought behind."

"If an unnatural law is to be declared against reason and faith, let it not be proclaimed by judicial lips. If the Church of England is to set aside its essential character, and write up over that gate through which passed Hooker, Chillingworth, Berkeley, Cudworth and Butler, this fatal motto—'All you who enter here leave thought behind,' let the Legislature write it with an iron pen and engrave it upon a block of stone, that 'he who runs may read.' Let it not be etched and scratched upon the margin of a law report by judicial inference and *ex post facto* construction."

But what if the law already exists? Then the Judge must administer it, and leave to the Legislature the credit of repealing it, as they must and will whenever the public sense of truthfulness in religious belief shall demand such an ennobling of the National Church. The able counsel went on to describe the tendency of such decisions as that now asked against theological scholarship and thought; he glances at the cynical insolence of the illustrious commoner and the fanatical ignorance of the illustrious nobleman who have lately made themselves notorious in the Essays and Reviews discussion; and finely asserts the necessity of free thought and learning for a higher cause than that of the Church of England—for that of Christianity. This was the conclusion of his able speech:

"One word upon the tendency of the legislation the prosecution would thus force upon your lordship. They wish you to assume, by a

judicial decision, a censorship over the writings of the clergy. You are not asked to decide on the truth of Dr. Williams's opinions. Should you condemn him, your judgment would not prove, and would not tend to prove, that Daniel did write the book of Daniel, or that it is a prophecy and not a history. It would prove this, and nothing else—that the Church of England is committed to those opinions, and that whoever succeeds in refuting them will have succeeded in refuting it. The worst enemies of the Church would be best pleased at such a judgment. '*Hoc Ithacus velit et magno mercentur Atridæ.*' The Romanist would rejoice and the Atheist would exult, for they would read in such a decision the recantation of the only Christian body which has hitherto really believed, and acted on the belief, that the God of revelation is also the God of reason, that the religion of Christ and the Word of God can take care of themselves, and that the business of men is not to defend their pre-conceived notions about either the one or the other, but to ascertain by the use of the ordinary tests of truth what their true purport may be. Consider, my lord, the stupendous folly and cowardice of the law which you are asked to pass. No doubt you can shut the mouths of the clergy. You can say, 'Whoever doubts whether Daniel wrote Daniel must be silent or lose his living.' But can you shut the mouths of the laity? Will any one in this age and country dare to suggest that the Christian religion and its vehicle, the Bible, are not to be criticised at all? Can you silence literature? Can you silence science? Can you silence history? Can you send every man to the stake or the gallows who doubts the authorship of Daniel? This you can do: You can teach literature, history, and science to despise Christianity and to hate it; you can suggest to them that the Church of England is a sort of ladies' school on a large and bad scale, where nothing is taught that can surprise an ignorant woman or interest an instructed man. You cannot arrest discussion itself. All that you can do is to prevent the clergy from taking part in it. You must fight. Your enemies will use all the resources of modern science. Will you blindfold your leaders, and make your soldiers fight in chains? The folly and cowardice of the proposed legislation do not stop here. Folly and cowardice never know where to stop. The proscription of literature and criticism and science amongst the clergy will not only give infidels a monopoly of them, and put scientific and learned men on the infidel side, but it will utterly destroy the value of the evidence of any stray man of learning or intellect who may be bribed to take orders in an emasculated Church by the prospect of influence or preferment. When such a man denies that Greek words are to be found in the text of Daniel, or tries to explain away inconsistencies in the Gospels by sophistry which it would not be worth while to produce at the Old Bailey or the Middlesex Sessions, he will produce smiles instead of conviction, and men will say that the evidence on which he really believes in the date of Daniel is the prospect of a bishopric. And what is the reason why we are to disarm or discredit the natural defenders of the Christian faith, and to sign treaties between Christ and darkness, between reason and the devil? The reasons are contained in two phrases, each invented by a well-known man to stigmatise and prejudice the cause which I defend. 'Free inquiry, by all means,' says one, 'but let it be by free inquirers.' 'Save us,' cries the other, 'save us from the tyranny of professors.' I know

not what is more repulsive, the cynical insolence in the one phrase or the fanatical ignorance of the other. 'Let free inquiry be confined to free inquirers.' Do sceptics want to fight at odds? Do they grudge to others the weapons which they use so freely themselves? The clergy of the Church of England not free inquirers! Then what are they? Are they a sort of third sex, which has neither the powers of men nor the charms of women? Are they alone to be doomed to ignorance in an age of knowledge, to silence in an age of freedom? I say they are free inquirers. They possess the only freedom worth having—namely, freedom secured by law. No doubt there are positions which they may not contest, and perhaps the number of such positions might wisely be diminished; but, subject even to that restraint, they are the freest clergy in the world, for they alone of all religious denominations are absolutely irresponsible both to their congregations and to their ecclesiastical superiors, except by the operation of the law of the land. All the Bishops in England may protest against Dr. Williams, but they cannot diminish by one jot or tittle his pastoral authority, suppress a word of his writings, or take away one shilling of his income, unless this Court holds that he has committed a crime against the law; and he has committed no crime unless he has said something which the law specifically forbids him to say. But there is another cry. 'Save us from the tyranny of professors.' 'What,' it is said, 'will become of the faith of unlearned men if professors are allowed to distinguish between the Authorised Version and canonical Scripture, and to tell us that without the help of Greek and Hebrew we can have very imperfect notions of the real meaning of either?' What does this cry mean in plain English? Simply this—'Protect us from truth, shield us from light. Since there are difficulties about the Bible, 'Be it enacted henceforth that the Authorised Version, according to the popular interpretation of it for the time being, shall be and be taken to be the Christian religion.' And this is put forward in the name of freedom, and for protection against tyranny! We do indeed need protection against tyranny, and I claim it at your lordship's hands. Protect us not from the tyranny of learning, but from the tyranny over learning. Protect us from the tyranny of a vague popular opinion—an ignorant popular clamour. I call upon your lordship as an English Judge to protect an English subject against mob law. How can we tyrannise over the illustrious nobleman who wishes to shut our mouths? He seems to fear that he is to be taught Greek and Hebrew by main force. All the power on earth cannot teach him Greek and Hebrew against his will. If he chooses to put his head in the sand for fear of seeing the hunters, cannot he do it? If he is afraid of the *Essays and Reviews*, he need not read them. With my client and his friends it is far different. Upon them you have an invincible hold. Your judgment may drive them from the Church, or close their mouths within it, and if you do, what will be the consequences to the Christian faith? Hitherto I have been forced, most unwillingly, to assume the position of an assailant and a critic, not indeed of the Bible, but of a loose and pernicious popular superstition about the Bible. Let me say a few words in another tone. If I were privileged to defend, not the liberty of the clergy, but the truth of the Christian religion—if I might assume the character, which I trust I have not said a word to abdicate, of a Christian advocate—I would say of those who press on this prosecution in their blind zeal for prejudices

which they mistake for the Christian faith, 'Lord, forgive them, for they know not what they do.' If they could but get one glimpse of the real gist of Christianity, one clear notion of the true nature of the Bible, they would welcome criticism and science as their best friends, they would see that it is by their use, and their use alone, that the true glory of the Bible can be brought out, and its power to bless mankind be developed to the utmost. I believe that almost all the scepticism which prevails amongst us is caused by the obstinate folly of those who persist in a mad attempt to substitute for belief in the contents of the Bible, belief in an incredible and gratuitous theory about the Bible, which is opposed not only to reason and authority, but to the whole scope, tendency, and design of the Bible itself. I most earnestly pray that your lordship may be guided to a right judgment, not so much for the sake of English law and liberty, mighty as these interests are, as for the sake of Christianity itself."

We cannot wonder that the learned counsel "sat down amidst some applause," the decorum of the Court notwithstanding.

We have now noticed the most salient points of the case as they appeared in the defence. For, be it observed, the defence in this case precedes the prosecution, through one of the curious technical forms of the Ecclesiastical Courts. The articles of accusation being put in, the counsel for the promoters asks the Court to admit them. Then the counsel for the defendant shews why they should not be admitted; the counsel for the prosecution argues for them; defendant's counsel replies, and the Judge considers his decision. It is as if, in a civil cause, the prisoner were asked to plead guilty, and declining to do so, were called upon to prove his innocence; then the evidence against him should be called, and then his counsel reply. Beautiful anomalies are these, truly, in our Courts Ecclesiastical!

We find only two things specially inviting notice in the pleadings for the prosecution. One has been already alluded to, namely, the proposal to put the scripture lessons of certain days in evidence against Dr. Williams as documents of the Church of England. Dr. Phillimore had proposed to put in the 53rd chap. of Isaiah, the lesson for Good Friday, when the Judge observed:

"It is a question of immense difficulty, and the consequences may be such as may be most alarming. I cannot see how, if I admit the whole of this to be read—the lesson which is stated here—how I could exclude from the consideration of the case any part of the whole Bible the other side might think fit to bring in. If that were done, the Court would be in this position—and it is a fearful position to think of—that it would have to decide a judicial question, whether the doctrines laid down by Dr. Williams are conformable to the Articles or Prayer-book, or are conformable to the Bible and the whole Bible bearing upon the extracts. Where I am to put the limit and to shut the door at present I don't see, and you must feel with me the extreme difficulty of embarking upon such a voyage."

The voyage was accordingly shortened for a cruise among the Church Articles.

The other point worth noticing was an attempted injustice only imaginable in ecclesiastical law. Dr. Phillimore proposed to quote from another of the essays, and hold Dr. Williams responsible for what another author had written, because the two writers appeared in one volume. This he was not allowed to do; but it is not quite clear whether he would have been forbidden that line of argument, had not the Judge been in possession of the fact that a separate prosecution was already instituted against the other essayist, Mr. Wilson, for his essay on the National Church. The following paragraph announces to all newspaper readers the next impending prosecution for heresy:

"Another prosecution has been commenced in the case of 'Essays and Reviews.' The promoter of the suit, by whom articles have been filed, is the Rev. J. Fendall, rector of Harlton, near Cambridge, and proctor in Convocation for the clergy of the diocese of Ely. The defendant is the Rev. Henry Bristow Wilson, B.D., formerly Fellow of St. John's College, Oxford, the author of the third essay in the volume entitled, 'Séances Nationale de Geneve.' It is likely that the same counsel will be retained. Mr. Toller is the proctor for Mr. Fendall; Mr. Dubois for Mr. Wilson."

We cannot regret that matters should be thus brought to legal settlement. Nothing can be more unsatisfactory to good and truth-loving men, within the Church or out of it, than the mixed narrowness of its symbols and latitudinarianism of many of its members, the perplexities of its Bishops and the intricacies of its Law Courts. Let it be known what the Church really is, and what she claims, and what she permits. If her legal constitution is (as we believe) intolerably narrow,—if the one apology that can be made for her lagging behind in the race of modern progress is, that her Articles were fit for three hundred years ago and are not fit for the present state of the world,—there is, we suppose, no surer way of making this palpably evident, and of insuring the necessary reform in her antiquated theology and lax-conforming ethics, than that her Law Courts should put forth their might against learning and free speech, till our secular English blood shall be inflamed to defend clerical learning and freedom.

Sub judice lis est. It is the general impression, we believe, that Dr. Lushington's judgment must be given substantially against Dr. Rowland Williams. We do not indeed see how it can be otherwise as to certain specified doctrines; though we believe the articles charged most broadly against him are the least capable of being sustained. But it will conduce to good morals that we should know what the Church law is and how far it needs alteration.

We should regret exceedingly, therefore, to find that any technical error was destined to set the proceedings aside, as the *National Reviewer* argues must be the case. He says (and the *Guardian* admits the correctness of the statement) that the Act

of Elizabeth 13th, under which these proceedings are instituted, refers to the Articles of 1563, which were only thirty-eight in number, not to those of 1571, which are the present code. The 29th Article *(Of the Wicked which eat not the Body of Christ in the use of the Lord's Supper)* is the additional one which constitutes the whole difference between the two codes. The *Guardian* therefore argues that, though this objection might have been fatal had it been taken in the suit "Ditcher *v.* Denison," in which the stress of Mr. Ditcher's argument rested on that 29th Article, it can have no force in the present case, in which all the Articles concerned belong equally to the earlier and later code. There is common sense in this conclusion.

But apart from the technical objection, the *National Reviewer* anticipates a judgment in Dr. Williams's favour. He says: "His alleged errors may be classed under the following heads—(1) they relate to Articles which admit of different meanings; or (2) to matters which are neither affirmed nor denied in the Articles; or (3) they are merely the views of Bunsen, alleged for the purpose of illustration."

On the third head, neither the *National Reviewer* in anticipating acquittal, nor the *Guardian* in somewhat savagely hoping for condemnation, seems sufficiently to have noticed that Dr. Rowland Williams has repeatedly and emphatically declined, through his advocates, attempting to shelter himself from responsibility in the way suggested. We agree with them both in thinking that many of the alleged heresies (indeed the chief ones, those large, broad heresies on the nature of inspiration and the critical rules of interpretation) belong to the second head. But we cannot avoid agreeing with the *Guardian* in thinking that there are various doctrinal opinions expressed which, though referring to "Articles which admit of different meanings," are irreconcilable with any meaning fairly attributable to such Articles.

If we anticipate a sentence against the defendant on some such points of detail, it is not in the spirit of the prosecutors and the approving *Guardian*. They wish to punish the man, and to silence thought, inquiry and biblical study in the Church of England. Quite conscientiously (as we know and believe of such men in general), they would make religion the opponent of science, they would refuse to the Scriptures the benefit of those materials of literary criticism which are applied to other ancient books; they would invite towards the clergy the contempt or pity of the laity; and spread far and wide the infidel's suspicion that the Church is a tool of State policy, and the gospel itself a delusion or an imposture.

No true Churchman can intelligently and deliberately wish to smother the spirit of inquiry which the Essays and Reviews expressed and have still more extended. The present state of things *must* be changed. It is too hollow for good men to advocate. It must be known and understood whether the liberality

so often claimed for the Church of England, and exercised by its best minds, depends on mere indifference to its own standards, or shall be recognized and guaranteed by law as the noble characteristic of this great nation's religious belief and worship. It must be known whether there is a law still capable, whenever invoked by popular or episcopal bigotry, of enforcing the beliefs of 1571 as the *ultimatum* of religious knowledge for 1862. It must be decided whether the narrowest minds, and those possessed of the least general culture in connection with theological beliefs, shall represent the Church of England and monopolize its benefices; or whether it shall hold out usefulness and honour to the nobler ambition of students and men of science also. And if the latter is the alternative desired at heart by Englishmen, perhaps the best way of opening their slow perception to the fact that the Church of the sixteenth century has not provided for the intellectual culture of the 19th, will be a few such decisions as are now sought in the Ecclesiastical Courts against thinkers and students. We sincerely and sorrowfully believe, in short, that the law is on the side of ignorance, narrowness and bigotry; and cannot believe that Churchmen will long rest satisfied with such a state of things when they have fully realized its existence. Time was when the Dissenters of this country, enjoying practical religious liberty in spite of intolerant laws which the spirit of the age had put to sleep, demanded and obtained the legal recognition of their freedom by the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts. Time is, when Churchmen, in the exercise of their conventional freedom of belief, are startled to find that the supposed obsolete laws of their own Church can be called into operation against them; and the alternative is offered them of submitting to spiritual slavery or demanding the recognition of their freedom by a revision of the laws and formularies of the Church.

To the solution of this alterative, we think the Ecclesiastical Courts will presently compel the long-indifferent laity on behalf of their long-perplexed clergy, if not also of themselves and their children. That it may be so is our best wish for the Established Church, and for the implied interests of religion and morals in this country. Perhaps the impending trial of Mr. Wilson for his essay "on the National Church" is more likely than any other procedure that could be fastened upon the Essays and Reviews, to bring into full discussion the principles of the Church of England as it is and as it ought to be, and to lead to a decision of the question whether free and accomplished minds can with pure honour minister at her altar, without a radical change in her doctrinal articles and symbols and in the laws which enforce them. In this view, we shall look at the proceedings in "Fendall *v.* Wilson" with still deepening interest, and trust that good may soon emerge out of the present evil of matters ecclesiastical.

ILLUSTRATIONS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT FROM A PASSAGE IN THE WRITINGS OF ARISTOTLE.

The passage referred to is in the second chapter of the treatise Περὶ κόσμου, or Περὶ τοῦ παντος, i. e. *Concerning the World*, or *Concerning the Universe*. In the opinion of many learned men, this work was not written by Aristotle in its present form, but was composed of extracts from his writings, made for popular use, and consequently with some additional ornament in the style. They, however, think that it was compiled very soon after his time, and that it is a faithful repetition of his language and doctrines.

The passage is as follows:

Κόσμος ἐστὶ σύστημα ἐξ οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς, καὶ τῶν ἐν τούτοις περιεχομένων φύσεων. Λέγεται δὲ καὶ ἑτέρως κόσμος ἡ τῶν ὅλων τάξις τε καὶ διακόσμησις, ὑπὸ θεῶντε καὶ διὰ θεῶν φυλαττομένη.—P. 391, ed. Bekker, 1831.

Translated:

"The world *(cosmos)* is a system consisting of heaven and earth and of the natures contained in them. Otherwise the world is said to be the orderly arrangement of all things, preserved both by gods and through gods."

In the phraseology of the passage three things are to be observed as illustrative of the language of the New Testament.

I. The term *cosmos (world)* is here used to denote the universe according to the philosophical conceptions of the day. It supposed the earth to be a sphere, placed in the centre and surrounded by the atmosphere, and that the clouds floated above the earth, with the moon, the sun, the five planets, and the fixed stars circulating in their orbits and still more remote from the centre. Paul uses the same language in his address to the Athenians on Mars Hill, Acts xvii. 24: "The God who made *the world and all things therein*, he, being Lord of *heaven and earth*, dwelleth not in temples made with hands." This use of the term *cosmos* was fixed and universally understood. The apostle must therefore be supposed to have employed it in the same sense in which it was used by Aristotle, and by numerous other writers of the highest authority, including some of the Jews. English readers should beware of supposing that "*the world*" in this interesting, grand, and instructive passage, means *the earth* only.

II. We have to remark the distinction made by Aristotle, or his copyist, between the two orders of *gods*, the higher and the lower. He supposes both orders to be concerned as agents in the conservation of the universe. His words illustrate 1 Cor. viii. 5: "Though there be that are called gods, whether in heaven or on earth (as there are gods many and lords many), yet to us there is one God, the Father." This passage, together with that above quoted, marks the grand distinction between the heathen polytheism, which clung even to the doctrine of the philosophers,

and the principle of the strict unity of the Supreme Creating Mind, which is the distinction of Divine Revelation. The passage belongs to a numerous class, which shew the extensive application of the word THEOS in ancient times, and the consequent fatality of arguments employed to prove the Supreme Divinity of Christ by the mere application to him of this simple term.

III. We have here a remarkably clear example of the distinction always made by ancient Greek writers between the two causal prepositions, HYPO and ΔIA. In my Vindication of Unitarianism, 4th edition, pp. 82—98, and Note D, I have fully discussed this important question in reference to the New Testament. I was not then acquainted with the passage to which I now direct the attention of the readers of the Christian Reformer. They will perceive the distinction which is made between the superior order of gods, and those inferior gods *through* whom, as instruments, the former exerted their agency.

JAMES YATES.

Highgate, near London, Dec. 22, 1861.

RELATION OF MIRACLE TO THE MIND OF CHRIST.

SIR,

I SHALL feel obliged if, in reference to my letter on the Relation of Miracle to the Mind of Christ, in a late No., you can find room for two short extracts bearing on more than one branch of the subject: one is from the Rev. John Llewelyn Davies' excellent tract, entitled "The Signs of the Kingdom of Heaven: an Appeal to Scripture on the Question of Miracles" (Tracts for Priests and People, No. iv.); the other, from "Notes on the Miracles of our Lord," by the present Dean of Westminster, Dr. Trench. I wish I had been cognizant of them before; but if you will accept them as notes, I shall be glad.

J. H. RYLAND.

"If the Person who died that He might redeem the whole world, and in whose clear manifestation both we and the things about us shall find our freedom and glory, be more distinctly recognized as holding the operations of nature in His hand in order that they may serve the Father's will, the laws of nature themselves ought to shine out more clearly and gloriously, and the relations of external things to the spirit of man ought to be more accurately understood. To this test, as to so many others, we must desire that the revelation of God in Christ should be practically brought. Let us only trust it enough, and refrain from corrupting it with our own conceits. We shall then have no need to guard it with threats and definitions. It will prove itself to be the power of God and the wisdom of God, stronger than all its apologists on the one side, and all its assailants on the other."—*Tracts for Priests and People*, First Series, No. iv.—Signs of the Kingdom of Heaven, pp. 46, 47.

"If in one sense the orderly workings of nature reveal the glory

of God (Ps. xix. 1—6), in another they hide that glory from our eyes; if they ought to make us continually to remember Him, yet there is danger that they lead us to forget Him, until this world around us shall prove, not a translucent medium, through which we behold Him, but a thick impenetrable veil, concealing Him wholly from our sights. Were there no other purpose in the miracles than this, namely, to testify the liberty of God, and to affirm the will of God, which, however, it habitually shews itself *in* nature, is yet more than and above nature, were it only to break a link in that chain of cause and effect, which else we should come to regard as itself God, as the iron chain of an inexorable necessity, binding heaven no less than earth, they would serve a great purpose, they would not have been wrought in vain."—*Notes on the Miracles of our Lord.* By Richard Chenevix Trench, B.D., &c. &c. Fifth Edition, revised, p. 20.

PHYSICAL PECULIARITIES OF THE ANCIENT HEBREWS.

Sir,

As hitherto I have not been successful in eliciting from your readers conversant with Hebrew any reply to the inquiry, what light the originals of the sacred books throw upon this subject (C. R., 1861, p. 49), —I must except the short but valuable communication of Mr. James Yates on the complexion of David (ib. p. 173),—I beg to send you what my friend, Dr. John Beddoe, of Clifton, has been able to glean from other sources. This appears in an able and instructive memoir "On the Physical Characteristics of the Jewish Race," printed in Part ii. Vol. I. of the "Transactions of the Ethnological Society of London," 1861, p. 222.

After recounting a good deal of curious lore derived from books and travellers, and a candid examination of the question, Dr. Beddoe says: "It is impossible, however, to maintain that the Jews were ever predominantly Xanthous. What evidence can be gathered from the Bible, from the Mishna and from the Talmud, all runs quite the other way; and of this I am assured by a great authority in Hebrew literature, the Rev. Aaron Green, of London. In the first place, *black* is always spoken of as the healthy colour of the hair in the regulations of Moses respecting leprosy. In Canticles, the bride is made to say, 'I am black, but comely.' 'Look not down on me because I am black' (dark). Hence it might be inferred that the general colour was fair, else why the apologetic tone of the interlocutor? But, in the same book, the same person says of the bridegroom, 'His head is as the most fine gold; his locks are curled, and black as a raven.' The Mishna and Talmud furnish strong grounds for supposing that other colours than black were exceptional. In them, black (shachor) is used as a synonym for hair (séor). Thus, 'He who vows the *black* of the head;' and in the Ethics, 'Affable to the black (young),' i. e. to the young whose hair is black. In the Talmud, commenting on Leviticus, it is said, 'He uses '*black*,' because it was a generic term for *hair*.' The word frequently translated '*fair*' in the Old Testament, signifies, I am informed, *beautiful*.

"The only mention of hair of other colours seems to be in the case of Esau, supposing that the word 'admoni,' '*red*,' all over *red*, like unto a hairy garment, refers to the hair, as it almost certainly does."

This passage will be seen to afford but little support to those who consider the oriental Jew to differ materially in complexion and colour of hair from his brethren in Europe.

There is another matter embraced in the quotation from Sir Gardner Wilkinson in my former communication (ib. p. 50), upon which it will probably be of some interest in this place to state the views of Dr. Beddoe; I mean the complexion and the origin of the usual portrait of Jesus:—"The comparatively straight profile spoken of by Sir Gardner Wilkinson, Mr. Blakesley and others, as pertaining usually to the Xanthous Jews of Africa and the East, is not unfrequent, I think, among their northern brethren of like complexion. In both divisions I have seen faces of great beauty, which by their form and colour strongly reminded me of the traditional representation of the Saviour; but such are, I think, much less rare in the East than at Prague or Vienna, and rarest of all in England. Mr. Heapley, in his recent papers in the *Art-Journal* (An Examination of the Antiquity of the Likeness of our Blessed Lord), has done much towards proving that, at least as early as the second century, Christian artists at Rome had abandoned their previous mode of representing Jesus, for the type which has since become universally accepted, and which, I have little doubt, was really derived from the East. I shall presently shew that the Jews of that day were almost certainly in the main a dark-haired people. If, therefore, the Roman artists had meant merely to represent Jesus as a Jew of great beauty, they would probably have copied from the handsomest examples of the common type; and the fact that they took in preference the rarer type, which is almost always associated with a light complexion, renders it almost certain that they followed a tradition,—a tradition which, having had but a short time to run, may not unlikely have been founded on a fact."—P. 232.

The peculiarities in feature and complexion of this remarkable race, and the variations to which they may be liable, are well deserving of much further investigation, and are so intimately associated with other subjects of inquiry, that one cannot but hope for continued researches, whether literary or physical. The questions involved are not yet very satisfactorily solved. Even Dr. Beddoe says his *first* object was to elicit what others have observed.

Shelton, Staffs., Nov. 25, 1861. J. Barnard Davis.

DR. CROMWELL AND MATERIALISM.

Sir,

I beg leave to controvert an assertion in the article headed "Justice to Priestley," in your last No., viz., that "we can form no actual conception of a thing without investing it with material attributes;" for I opine that we have as actual a conception of space, in which matter exists, as of matter itself. Astronomy discloses to us innumerable orbs moving in infinite space, not identical with it. Vainly do some tell us that space is merely ideal; we have a steady conviction that it is something actually existing, something existing independently of beings and things which have outlines and organizations. Let me add, that our consciousness of the total dissimilarity between a pain of mind and a

headache, convinces us, generally speaking, that there *is* a dualism of spirit and matter in mortal man; and that while all who use the *word* "God," and confess that there are marks of wise design in animate and inanimate nature, are Theists, yet to deny that "God is a Spirit," i.e. an Infinite Mind, of which our minds are finite images, is to depart widely from Christ and Paul, and to go back towards the altar of "THE UNKNOWN GOD" at ancient Athens.

T. J. READ.

[We insert Mr. Read's letter, but must decline any further discussion in our pages of the metaphysical point he moots.—ED. C.R.]

THANKSGIVING FOR CHRIST. BY R. E. B. MACLELLAN.

LAUDS and praises let us bring,
That our God's high will appointed
Christ to be both Lord and King;
Made of him His own Anointed;
Gave to Jesus from His own
Fulness divine a copious treasure
Of light and love; on him alone
Poured His Spirit without measure.
Follow him with work and word;
Lip and life in concert gather;
And confess that Christ is Lord,
To the praise of God, the Father.

Song and psalm to God be paid;
Soul! relate the thrilling story!
That through Jesus He displayed
To us the brightness of His glory.
Christ's love and pity both declare
That he to longing man hath given
An image full, an image fair,
Of God who dwells in highest heaven.
Follow him with work and word;
Lip and life in concert gather;
And confess that Christ is Lord,
To the praise of God, the Father.

God by Jesus doth bestow,
To every creed and tongue and nation,
From sin and suffering, death and woe,
Promise of a great salvation.
God upraised him from the dead,
Unbarred for him the heavenly portals,
So gave us the hope to tread
Through the land of the immortals.
Follow him with work and word;
Lip and life in concert gather;
And confess that Christ is Lord,
To the praise of God, the Father.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

The Quarterly Review, No. 221. January, 1862.

The subjects of this No. are, Railway Control, the Autobiography of Cornelia Knight, the new Educational Code, Iceland, Spain's Revival, Alison's Life of Lord Castlereagh, the American Crisis, and the late Prince Consort. The review of Miss Knight's book indicates that the Toryism of to-day no longer does battle for the character of George IV. Hopeless as the defence is now admitted to be, the reviewer shews some want of temper in relation to this last and honest witness, and her testimony as to the character of the Regent and his Court. In the same spirit, the writer on Lord Castlereagh, though obviously embarrassed by Sir Archibald Alison's blundering book, tries to elevate Lord Castlereagh into a political hero and a far-seeing statesman. Both subjects have a certain interest to those whose recollections go back some forty or fifty years, but are to the younger public matters of indifference. By dwelling chiefly on his foreign policy, the reviewer avoids some of the less creditable portions of Castlereagh's public life. There is equal want of generosity and truthfulness in the sneers at the genius and policy of Canning, who was worth a hundred of the Londonderry race. The one sterling article of the No. is that on the Prince Consort, which is wise, genial and eloquent. It is evidently penned by one who has had access to the best sources of information respecting the habits and employments of the Prince, to whose virtues and talents it offers such remarkable testimony. The spirit of the article is a satisfactory proof that Queen Victoria and her late Consort have lived down the Tory dislike of which they were once the objects. After speaking of him as a "Prince gentle, pure and upright, wise and good," the writer glances at the merciful compensations which may alleviate in some degree the national sorrow.

"He has died with his own beloved ones about him, cared for and tended by the highest skill in the land; with the prayers of multitudes of the subjects of that agonized Lady besieging Heaven all importunate for his life, and the wail of a great nation rising muffled about his couch. . . Nor let it either ungratefully and untruly be said that we have utterly lost him whom we so deeply lament. A life spent among us for above twenty years in one ceaseless stream of good and wise works, no death of the body can be said to sweep away. In the light of a glorious example, long watched by the good with ever-increasing admiration, that life is ours still."

The greatness attributed to the Prince is described as of that kind which results from a perfect balance of mental power and the moral qualities. Greatness of this kind, to be appreciated, needs to be known as a whole. It appeals not to the love of the marvellous, but "to our deeper sympathies and nobler aspirations." At first, the nation was strangely blind to the promise of excellence which the Prince Consort gave. This blindness the reviewer attributes not to malice, nor to intentional disrespect, but to the singular and anomalous situation, in respect to the Constitution of England, occupied by a Prince Consort. The precedents set by former Princes did not give the nation ground for large expectations.

"If any one had ventured to prophesy that this untried youth and foreigner

was to be foremost in the ranks of every form of intelligence, foremost in plans of active philanthropy, foremost in diligence, order and judgment, in purity of morals, and the practice of domestic virtue, he would have been scouted as a dreamer of dreams. A youth just twenty years of age, and yet fully furnished in every scholarly department of learning and taste; a modern German Prince, and yet the worshiper of constitutional laws and the friend of progress; inexperienced in the art of life, exalted in station and suddenly exalted in fortune, possessing great personal advantages, and ushered into a gay and luxurious court, and yet not one blot on his moral escutcheon; royal yet disdaining every royal road to attainment and every traditional royal right to self-indulgence. Surely we may be pardoned for not readily believing in a character which the history of Princes and mankind had doubted to be fabulous."

After some particulars of his descent from the best Protestant Princes of Germany, the reviewer recurs to the jealousies entertained by our "insular" people against the Prince, and the quiet and judicious mode in which he, wounding none of our constitutional susceptibilities, carved out for himself a path to usefulness and honour. The Prince's loyal love to the Queen, and the return of the feeling on her part, are next well described in relation to the Prince's position in England and his right to participate in whatever affected the welfare and progress of the nation.

An elaborate notice of the various addresses spoken by the Prince is introduced by these remarks:

"In a country where scarcely a day passes without examples of the oratory of the most gifted and practised of her children, it was no small test of a Prince, foreign in birth and education, to enter the lists of public speaking, and measure himself against a standard no less peculiar to ourselves than high in mark. But here again the lofty tone of the mind, in all its parts, ensured his success. Casting aside all ambition of personal display, he sought simply and grandly to fathom the principles of whatever subject he had in hand, bringing to bear upon it a profoundness of thought and unstudied nobility of language, which, for all the national self-complacency, will ever remain the newest thing an English public can hear. And the truth was mighty and always prevailed, and the most eloquent of his hearers acknowledged that a new grace, beyond the reach of art, had been won in their own national accomplishment. The man who sees clearly, thinks correctly, reasons profoundly, and knows largely, has power over all subjects fitted for the human mind to investigate. Wonder therefore ceases as admiration and respect rise, as we view the varied topics over which this gifted individual shewed equal power."

The Prince's first appearance as a public speaker in England was in 1840, when acting as President of the Society for the Extinction of Slavery. After large quotations from the speeches of the Prince, which fully justify the reviewer's encomiums, he says, "It would be difficult to cite any instance of the same amount of spoken words so entirely devoid of the element of superficiality." The writer presently remarks:

"Nature, no less than position, and far more still, had marked this mind out as a centre to others. No man of any particular form of intelligence ever looked back on an interview with the Prince, without feeling that beyond his own especial orbit of interest, he had caught glimpses of a large and consistently-working intellectual system. For a time, it is true, each professor of art or science believed that he had found a devotee to his own particular shrine; after a while each knew that the Prince's perfect comprehension of one was but the measure of his knowledge of all."

The reviewer dwells on the Prince's knowledge of military affairs, his taste for the fine arts and personal skill in drawing and music, his singular aptitude for our modes of public business, and his ability as a letter-writer. His letters are described as "clear, vigorous, entirely free from mannerism, and abounding in original ideas." The reviewer handles discreetly the presumed unpopularity of the Prince, and, while rebuking the "vulgar high" and "vulgar low" who discredited themselves by the detraction of a Prince whose merits they were incapable of appreciating, truly says that by the mass of the English nation he was "honoured, respected and beloved."

With these wise and eloquent words this admirable article concludes:

"He suffered injustice; he bore disappointment; but his joy no man taketh from him! Seen by the light which his peerless life has shed upon his position, it now appears the noblest that a noble mind could desire. His not the applause and homage, his not the pomps and the vanities of sovereignty; but his the wisdom and the forethought, the lofty, manly, Christian devotion, which surrounded a woman's crown, as with an earthly Providence. This has been a joint reign in all but the name; and let us pray that it may be so still; for not even death can sever that long intimacy of two hearts and two wills which God has joined together. Alone, the Royal Widow must bear in time to face her loving subjects; alone, her loving and most deeply-sorrowing subjects must bear to gaze upon her august person; but the knowledge of that example none can take from her or from us. For *his* sake the Queen is already sublimely struggling to fulfil her duties; for *his* sake shall we not doubly strive to do ours? We can conceive no higher human spectacle than that of our Sovereign Lady thus bowing her head to the will of God, and raising it again by the Divine aid. If we have loved her in her years of happiness, shall we not venerate her now? And this, too, will be *his* doing, who has done so much for her and for us! So that his influence is yet felt in the workings of that sorrow of which we venture to foresee the hallowed uses."

The Edinburgh Review, No. 233. January, 1862.

The No. opens with an account of the life and writings of William Paterson, a Scottish Presbyterian, an associate of John Locke, the founder of the Bank of England. Happily for the institution he established and the kingdom whose name it bears, he was too shrewd a man to confound intrinsic value and its symbol, and knew that no authority could give to any artificial medium of exchange a permanent value irrespective of the credit of the parties in whose name it was issued. William Paterson deserves to be remembered inasmuch as he devoted his talents to the solution of those important social problems which are involved in economical science. The second article gives us the substance of Mr. W. G. Sewell's "Ordeal of Free Labour in the British West Indies." Much interesting information is given respecting the transition state of the coloured people of the West Indies, who, if not born in slavery, are all descended from slaves, and are scarcely yet capable of self-government. Several generations must be given to work out the problem. The reviewer contests the soundness of Mr. Sewell's anticipation that the mulattos will form the future rulers and leaders in the West Indies, putting more faith in Anglo-Saxon vigour and perseverance than in African passion, and on physiological grounds doubting the permanence of the mulatto race. It is a remarkable fact in physiology that the mulatto, where there is no renewed intermixture

of Anglo-Saxon or of pure African blood, wastes and declines. The reviewer closes an interesting article by applying his principles to the case of slavery in America. There follow articles on the Science of Language, the Military Defence of the Colonies, and Felix Mendelssohn's Letters from Italy and Switzerland, of which an authorized translation by Lady Wallace is about to appear. Next we have an abstract of certain blue books on Lighthouses, the subject of Life-boats and Wrecks being tagged to it. If less statistical and more descriptive, the article would have been more generally read and probably not less useful. Then comes a very interesting account of the Mormons, founded on the travels of Jules Remy and of our own countryman, Captain Burton. The reviewer speaks of Remy's prefatory essay on the religious development of the American mind as executed both with earnestness of purpose and a breadth of impartiality. The Frenchman takes Joseph Smith as a type of the Mystic school of thought (the English pupils of that school will not relish the conjunction), Emerson of the Pantheistic, and Channing of the Rationalist school. The reviewer points out a very remarkable prophecy of Robert Southey, published in 1829 in his Colloquies, and fulfilled in the rise of Mormonism. The poet was led by the importance he attached to a powerful Church Establishment to anticipate the development of some new form of fanaticism and imposture on "that part of the Anglo-American Union into which the older States continually discharge the restless portion of their population, leaving laws and gospel to overtake it as they may." But the singular fact in Mormonism is, that it draws its constant levies of recruits, not from the American States, but from England and Wales, the country in which law is more respected than in any other on the face of the globe, and in which the Church system in which the poet put his faith is in full operation. Southey, were he alive, would doubtless argue, that as the Mormon levies are taken from the Dissenters, the fact confirms his philosophy.

"The continual increase of the Mormon population is supplied, not by the United States, but by emigrants from some of the most enlightened countries of Europe. The proportion of the native Anglo-American to the foreign born is said to be not one in ten. *Great Britain furnishes the largest proportion by five to one:* Germany few: Denmark and Switzerland a large quota. No Catholic country contributes its contingent with the exception of a casual relay from Italy. Sweden alone has attached penalties to the profession of the religion, and checked the emigration of its people by legal means. It is a wonderful fact that out of this England of ours should go forth annually to the Salt Lake City a large body of men and women, who from the modicum of property they carry with them may be assumed to be at least of the upper rank of agriculturists or artisans, and who from the very fact of the venture which they undertake, must be persons of some energy of will and superiority of character. We have no means of knowing distinctly the immediate influences brought to bear upon them, but we have reason to believe that the arguments in use are rather of an economical than of a religious character. The persons abducted are almost universally Dissenters, and Wales supplies a larger proportion than any other part of Great Britain. We believe that little novelty in matters of faith is inculcated, and peculiarities, such as 'the plurality' in marriage, only alluded to when they become matters of objection. In the same way the violent interpretation given to Scripture by Mormon expositors is probably revealed with much caution to the Bible-loving people of England, who would be somewhat shocked at first to be told that St. Peter

assassinated Ananias and Saphira, and that the indignant Apostles trampled Judas to death."

There can, we think, be little doubt that the magnet in Mormonism which has attracted so many to its institutions is its socialism. There are in our own country not wanting proofs of the delusive power of the socialistic idea, and of the sacrifices that multitudes among the uneducated or the partially educated are willing to make to realize it. How grossly the socialist principle is violated in the "City of the Saints" we need not stop to illustrate. Of the great body of the people under Mormon rule it is conceded that they are temperate, courageous and steadily industrious. In a country not naturally unfavourable to man, the results of habits such as these must be a large production of wealth and physical comfort.

Its polygamy was an after-thought in the Mormon system. In the original book of Doctrines and Covenants, 1841, it is ruled that "one man should have one wife, and one woman but one husband." It was but a few months after the promulgation of this decree that Joe Smith professed to have received from Heaven another and a different message. How rapidly the institution of polygamy grew among the Mormons is evidenced by these statistical returns, drawn from the census of 1858. There were residing at Utah 387 families with not less than 7 wives; 730 with not less than 5; 1100 with 4; and 1400 with not less than 2. The reviewer well remarks:

"Mormon polygamy will probably endure as long as Mormon rule, but will not survive it a day. It is the creation of priestly despotism, and will fall with it. The weakest believer in the progress of mankind can show no examples of the permanence of a system founded on a descent in the standard of morality deliberately adopted, and the result, not of passion, but of perverted reason. It was the saying of the man who has left the saddest fame of all notable men, 'that the mind of man, like the globe it inhabits, is ever one half in darkness, while the other half is exulting in the light:' but a society that accepts the abnegation of the higher elements of humanity, will soon be reduced entirely to the lower, or be absorbed into some other form. Already Brigham Young is compelled to preach against knowledge and literature, and Captain Burton allows that a large number of the younger and more enterprising men leave the colony for a larger and freer sphere of action."

What the future of the City of the Saints may be, it would require a bold prophet to foretel. If left alone (as now they have some chance) by the government of the United States, they may be split into rival factions by the intrigues of those who may hereafter essay to wield the power now in the hands of Brigham Young.

The 8th article has for its subject May's Constitutional History of England. The reviewer's narrative of the policy of the two last Georges and their effect on the constitution of the kingdom, forms a fit introduction to a tribute to the constitutional rule of Queen Victoria, and to the wisdom and patriotism of the Prince whose loss the nation now laments. After describing the political, and in some respects irresponsible, position of the late Prince Consort, the reviewer observes:

"Such a position would have become dangerous, and perhaps impossible had it not been maintained with consummate judgment, and a constant deference to the constitutional rights of the Ministers of the Crown. But although the Prince had on many subjects strong political convictions which he ex-

pressed and defended with great ability,—and indeed he seldom failed to form his own judgment on the political questions of the day,—yet he never stooped to promote his own views by underhand practices; he abhorred intrigue; he allowed no personal predilections to tempt him aside from the straight path; and his course throughout was as honest and patriotic as it was able and judicious. His influence was at once so general and so salutary that, like the pressure of the atmosphere, it was unfelt. He hit the exact mean on which authority rests in a free country, and he contributed to make the Crown act as the adjusting balance of our institutions at home and of our policy abroad. Fondly attached to his native, as well as to his adopted country, no object lay nearer to his heart than to support in Germany the cause of constitutional freedom and national unity, while he desired that the foreign influence of England should ever be employed to maintain the faith of treaties, the principles of public law, and the cause of gradual and rational progress. He judged these questions by the principles of a statesman rather than by the interests of a politician; and as his position had placed him beyond the region in which men contend for political power, he sought, without distinction of parties or persons, to apply his dignified, liberal, and honest rule of life to the smallest as well as the greatest objects to which he turned his clear and comprehensive mind."

The two other articles are on Mrs. Norton's new poem and on "Belligerents and Neutrals." The latter naturally diverges into the whole American question. The writer argues that the present condition of the American people is essentially revolutionary, and that this revolutionary type is not of very recent origin. After adducing instances in their domestic history, and in their treatment of foreign countries, especially our own, to prove that the respect of the citizens of America is not for law, but force, the reviewer continues:

"What are they all but proofs that the rulers of the American people have established their popularity and power on revolutionary appeals to the passions of the populace, rather than on the restraints and obligations of law and reason? Can any one wonder at these injuries to foreign nations, when in the very Senate of the United States, a man like Mr. Sumner, illustrious by his talents and his virtues, was struck down by a ruffian, who in his turn received the thanks of his fellow-citizens; and when another man, a red-handed assassin like Mr. Sickles, is acquitted by an American jury, and now actually commands a brigade in the army of the United States? When such things as these happen, and happen unavenged, they betoken the approach of a great convulsion, perhaps of the dissolution of society itself. Indeed the very same remark was made many years ago by Dr. Channing in a letter to the late Mr. Clay: 'Among us,' said that eminent man, 'a spirit of lawlessness pervades the community, which if not repressed threatens the dissolution of our present forms of society. The invasions of the right of speech and of the press by lawless force, oblige us to believe that a considerable portion of our citizens have no comprehension of the first principles of liberty. It is an undeniable fact that in consequence of these and other symptoms, the confidence of many reflecting men in our free institutions is very much impaired. Some despair. That main pillar of public liberty, mutual trust among citizens, is shaken. That we must seek security for property and life in a stronger government is a spreading conviction. Men who in public talk of the stability of our institutions whisper their doubts—perhaps their scorn—in private.' If this was the language of this great and virtuous man in 1837, what would he say in 1862?"

Would that the United States had some citizens as wise and fearless as Dr. Channing ever was to guide them out of the mazes of their political entanglement! Unhappily, the crisis in their history has hitherto

called out no great men to instruct their countrymen. Some men previously esteemed for their talents have dwindled into very little men indeed. Is this the consequence of the low and selfish aims of American policy both North and South of the Potomac?

Ears of Corn from various Sheaves: being Thoughts for the Closet. Second Edition. London—E. T. Whitfield, 178, Strand. 1862.

More wholesome and nourishing food for man's spiritual nature has never been selected than that proffered for sale in this admirable little book. It is full of thoughts that have grown out of the deepest experiences of some of the best and noblest souls. Having found their own way to a real communion with God, these writers become most efficient aids to such as are seeking Him who is the Perfection of all Truth, Beauty and Goodness—the Life of our highest life—to abide in whom is blessedness, to depart from whom is death. Not that this book is one of the elegantly-bound volumes of meditations and confessions, to be read in luxurious apartments, for the culture of a sentimental devoutness. It is, indeed, full of aids to devotion; but it abounds also with aids to the attainment of that practical Christian spirit which we need to sustain and animate us amid the details of our ordinary life, or when we are abroad labouring in behalf of truth and humanity. Its aim is to fix the religious affections on the Holy One, and then to bring them under the beneficent control of the higher reason and judgment, that they may be so developed as to consecrate the whole outward life. We scarcely know, indeed, whether it would prove more valuable to those who, in a disheartening sense of estrangement from God, need the thoughts of holier men to hint to them their unwatched weaknesses and unrepented sins, and to shew them the way of return to their Father, or to those who, having been made partakers of the spirit of the life that was in Christ, find incentives to the attainment of sweeter graces and nobler virtues in the religious experiences of those exalted characters towards whom all true souls have an upward look. We earnestly commend this volume to our readers, especially to our pastors who are seeking to diffuse silent helps to their work, as pre-eminently calculated to develop a healthy religious life in our communities. We should be glad to see this book reach, not only a second, but a twentieth edition.

A Defence of my Professional Character. By the Rev. Dunbar I. Heath, M.A., Vicar of Brading, &c. &c. 12mo. Pp. 199. London—Tallant and Co.

Mr. Heath appeals from the Court of Arches to common sense and simple justice, from Dr. Lushington to the people of England. Dissatisfied with the account of his opinions given by the advocates retained by the Bishop of Winchester and in part accepted by the Judge, he is resolved to place in the hands of all fair men, of all interested in Christianity, a plain exposition of his opinions upon those important subjects, for explaining which he has been condemned. Accordingly he gives, in a series of short chapters, the language of the Articles of the Church in English and Latin, and contrasts his own opinion thereon with that decreed by Dr. Lushington to be the grammatical and natural interpretation. He quotes various scriptures and passages from

Anglican divines in support of the position that, while Dr. Lushington is ignorant of their meaning, the Rev. D. I. Heath upholds and does not contradict the Thirty-nine Articles of his Church. He protests against the admission of Scotch Calvinism as the orthodoxy of the Church of England, and appeals in his own behalf to the opinions of "Platonizing divines in high station in the Church of England, not many in number, but eminent in talent and position."

Mr. Heath expresses his wonder that his little volume of Sermons, never published save in the town of Ryde, and of which up to the time of the proceedings in the Ecclesiastical Court only 150 copies were circulated, should have been made the subject of a costly prosecution by "an aged Bishop, always hitherto considered most calm and cautious."

He puts the charge against him in a way that deserves the serious consideration of all those clergymen who teach doctrines inconsistent with *any* of the Articles or Creeds to which they declare their assent and consent.

"As a matter of fact the charge against me assumes the existence of a contract between me and the Venerable Church of England. It assumes rightly that I on my part have engaged to teach and advance our common Master's religion in some form consistent with the literal and grammatical meaning of certain formularies. The church court expels me on the ground that I have broken this engagement."

An important practical question will follow the convictions which seem to be almost things of course in our Ecclesiastical Courts. Are clergymen to take their own sense of the Articles or Creeds, or that which is pronounced by the Courts to be the grammatical and consequently legal sense? If any considerable number of the more thoughtful and liberal clergy feel themselves bound to accept the decision of the Court of Arches and Privy Council on this point, the result of these proceedings may have a very serious influence on the future character of the Church of England.

When, about fourteen years ago, the Church was convulsed by the throes of the clergy protesting against the appointment of Dr. Hampden to the Bishopric of Hereford, Lord Russell, in a letter which he addressed to the clergy of Bedford, told them that "if such means as have been taken to ruin the reputation of Dr. Hampden are to deprive a clergyman of those distinctions which our Church boasts of maintaining as the rewards of learning and piety, a fatal blow is struck at all profound inquiry, at all enlightened pursuit of truth, at all clerical independence."

Far more serious than the clerical brutum fulmen which assailed Bishop Hampden, are the prosecutions which in 1862 are directed through clerical instigation against the theological speculations of certain intelligent and learned clergymen. We already hear that the more distinguished men of the two Universities now frequently decline holy orders. Must the future ministers of the National Church be confined to those whose want of intelligence deprives subscription of all its difficulties, or to those traders in holy things who would subscribe 390 articles, if required, as carelessly as they now do 39?

We return to Mr. Heath's Defence of his Professional Character. There is something touching in these prefatory remarks:

"To be judged a heretic by a church court in the year 1861, if I have my conscience void of offence, and be provided with some means of living in the

place of that of which I am by law deprived, is personally but little painful. A heretic who suffers for the grand and glorious doctrine that Jesus Christ will do justice to all, both good and bad, is, by the very nature of his heresy, more happy in mind than a man who cannot bring himself to believe this comfortable doctrine. Better to be a heretic, believing and actively teaching this great eternal Verity, than an orthodox man who fears to embrace it. Such an heretic am I; and I am happy in mind; and, through my very persecutions, I have had a such large field opened to me for continual conversation on Divine things with all sorts of men, of all sorts of ranks and opinions, that I cannot help feeling myself, by the very necessity of my position, to be leading a useful life.

"Simply to deprive me of a Vicarage (which I built myself) in the Church of England, and not also to burn me, for preaching that all men, good and bad, will live under the Righteousness of God, may be considered as rather a progress in the principles of Him who has Himself introduced Judgement and Justice, or Righteousness, to the knowledge of the earth; and whose Spirit, now striving for that purpose, will gradually cause mankind to carry out, by their own conscious or engrafted faith, that Justice which He, by His faith, first introduced to our knowledge. . . . .

"I perceive a grand Truth. My defenders are kind enough to say it is a mere harmless eccentricity. My opponents say it is a criminal heresy. It is at any rate that on which my own most innermost spirit depends for its support in all social struggles and disheartenments. . . . .

"I have not been brought bodily to the stake. What is at stake in these happier days is the character of the man who is judged heretical. Character is an impression made by an individual in the course of time upon his brother men. If that impression be a deep one, causing a deep conviction that its producer is a wise and good man, then the marring and degradation of this character, or even a passing attack on it, produces an injury to society; much more to society than to the individual, when the conscience, the pleasures, and the means of the condemned himself are superior to the world's opinion. . . .

"I cannot shut my eyes to the fact that my character, my professional character, my character as a plain hard-working, straightforward, matter of fact Interpreter of the Holy Word of God to my brethren, is most grievously and seriously attacked by my condemnation in the church court of the Province of Canterbury. True, the sentence only touches my temporalities, true, my pleasures will be multiplied, my usefulness increased, my means of intercourse with society enlarged, and a Parliamentary career (?) perhaps opened to me by my enforced absence from my vicarage: but in technically defending my temporalities I am of course actually defending in many men's estimation my personal honour, dearer to man's eyes than life and wife. If I retired now without further defence I should in many men's eyes be dishonoured. Such dishonour would hurt society. Personally I care not one jot nor one tittle for this most truly honourable dishonour. Yet I know of no good reason why I should choose to submit to be dishonoured even in man's eyes, without an effort to prevent it. I see many reasons why such submission, in the present stirring epoch of man's history, would be most prejudicial and dishonourable."

The cost of the appeal which Mr. Heath is now prosecuting is necessarily heavy, and he invites the public who approve of his proceedings to subscribe to his defence fund, and intimates that subscriptions will be received at Messrs. Bosanquet and Co., 73, Lombard Street. Many who dissent from Mr. Heath's theological interpretations may yet be disposed to aid him, from respect for his integrity and a desire to see the National Church essentially Protestant and free. We anticipate only one result from all these proceedings, the affirmation in our Courts of Mr. Disraeli's hint that free inquiry is only for free inquirers, and therefore is a luxury not within the reach of the clergy of a subscription and creed-bound Church.

INTELLIGENCE.

EVENTS OF THE MONTH, WITH EDITORIAL NOTES.

Jan. 1. The year opened auspiciously for the Unitarian cause in England with the inauguration of the "Church of the Messiah," as the new place of worship is called, built by the Unitarian congregation recently worshiping in the New meeting-house, Birmingham. All things concurred to make the opening service a success. The devotional service of Mr. Bache, the honoured minister of the church, the noble sermon of Mr. Madge (which we hope to see in print), were all that could be desired. The day was for the season brilliant. A very fine congregation (including ministers from many districts) and a remarkably handsome collection gave becoming emphasis to the occasion. This new Unitarian church is well situated in the great thoroughfare from Birmingham to Edgbaston, and its architecture is, if not faultless, very striking. The spire is lofty and graceful, the entrance to the church exceedingly rich. The interior we were pleased to observe perfect in two important particulars, the transmission of light and sound. The cost of the building, about £12,000, has been, by the munificent liberality of the congregation, nearly, if not altogether, raised. The schools, which have exercised for more than half a century a not unimportant influence on the town of Birmingham, are not to be given up. While the Church of the Messiah will have its Sunday-school, the teachers of the old school have resolved to continue their labours in other premises in the old district, and are supported by contributions from various sources.

On the same day, in Sheffield, the foundation-stone was laid of a school-house in connection with the Upperthorpe chapel and congregation, of which Mr. Page Hopps is the zealous pastor. It is a most gratifying fact that the congregation in Norfolk Street, under the genial influence of Mr. Brooke Herford, continues its zealous help to the sister congregation. The building is to be in the Early English style, to have but one story, 68 feet by 34, to accommodate 360 scholars, to cost £700 (£500 of which is already contributed), and to be completed before Midsummer.

Jan. 6. The annual meeting of the congregation worshiping in High-Pavement chapel, Nottingham, gave occasion to a pleasant, spirited and useful social meeting, at which 300 persons assembled. Another noble educational effort has been made by the congregation in the erection of school buildings at Pease Hill, at the cost of nearly £500, in which 217 Sunday scholars are taught. The congregation intend to make this the beginning of a mission Unitarian church, hoping to secure the services of some one who will be both schoolmaster and preacher. This is, we believe, the true way for our congregations in cities and populous towns to increase.

The anxiety which weighed during the first week of the year on the heart of the nation in relation to America and the intentions of its Government, is happily lightened, if not altogether removed, by the announcement that President Lincoln and his Cabinet consent, in deference to the demand of England, backed by the opinions of every European Government that has spoken on the subject, to give up the prisoners wrongfully seized when under the protection of the British flag. It would have been a blunder as well as a crime if, under such circumstances, America had committed itself to the perilous issues of a war with England. To see two nations, speaking the same tongue, professing the same religion, and bound together by a thousand historical and commercial ties, shedding each other's blood and involving each other in want and misery through political passion, would have been a spectacle so sad as to weaken our confidence in and hopes for humanity. Yet the war now raging between the North and South of the once United States, has in it the very elements of evil that we should ascribe to a war between ourselves and the States. When the utter hopelessness of a renewal of the Union is taken into the account, is it possible to exaggerate either the folly or the wickedness of the civil war? It has been hitherto said that war is the game of *kings*, played at the cost of their subjects. But revolutionary wars, like this in America, shew that the sovereign people may be as reckless of their own blood and treasure as the most ambitious kings.

The tidings of the public insolvency of the Northern States lets in a little feeble glimmer of hope on the dark scene, and people argue that without money the war must in no long time die out through mere exhaustion. The costliness of war is not all evil. It hinders greater evils. France, Austria, and in a lesser degree our own country, reveal the painful burthens that await a people given to war. But never did national history disclose with such

rapidity and with such startling effect the state of confusion and ruin into which war throws the finances of a nation. The sad part of the story is, that not they who commit the crime alone suffer. They leave to after generations an entail of national burthen and distress.

Jan. 11. In none of our congregations are more judicious and indefatigable friends of education, secular and religious, to be found than at Dean Row, Cheshire, one of our ancient Presbyterian foundations. To the neat and venerable chapel, so successfully renovated a few years ago through the exertions of Rev. John Colston, large and commodious school buildings are now added, at a cost of £600. A part of this amount is conditionally promised by the Committee of Privy Council, but the larger portion has been raised by subscription. On the completion of the building, and in celebration of the opening of the school under a suitable master, a social meeting was held this day, under the presidency of that earnest friend of education, Mr. Samuel Robinson. On the following Sunday, the occasion was improved in two sermons at Dean-Row chapel by Rev. W. Gaskell. Handsome collections were made, but help is yet required to supply the needful fittings of the school-rooms. The school-room is 37 feet by 20. There is a class-room, 16 feet by 13, with a gallery such as is approved in modern schools. There is also a teacher's house. One feature of especial interest in this proceeding is, that the land on which the new premises are constructed was given by some members of the Church of England.

Jan. 14. A new mission chapel was opened at Pepperhill, in the parish of Halifax and in the vicinity of Northowram, the scene of the self-denying labours of one of the saints in the calendar of English Nonconformity, Oliver Heywood. The religious service was conducted by Rev. R. L. Carpenter and Dr. Beard. The building will be used as a school-house as well as a chapel, and the best influences, it may be hoped, will radiate from it on the rough but right-hearted people of this mountain hamlet. The cost of the building is £450, of which sum nearly one-third has yet to be raised. Can our Associations and Fellowship Funds find a better object for help?

Jan. 15. The annual meeting of the Trustees of Manchester New College, London, was held in the former city. The Committee congratulated the friends of the College on the fact that it is "peacefully and prosperously performing the noble work for which it was founded." If the wish expressed by the Committee is fulfilled in the future history of the institution, and it prove "*the means of educating many faithful ministers of Christ*," the present state of peace and prosperity will be deservedly perpetuated. But the Committee and Professors must not interpret the silent acquiescence of many old friends of the College into actual approval of the theological instruction given therein to our future ministers.

Jan. 20. Our congregation at Bridport held a social meeting under the presidency of their minister, Mr. Short. The occasion was improved by speeches expository of Unitarianism, which is well described in the *Inquirer's* report as "the most Christian theology and the most practical religion." The Bridport congregation traces its origin to the labours and sufferings of Mr. Eaton, one of the ejected worthies of 1662.

Jan. 20—22. The proceedings of the Unitarian Home Missionary Board at Manchester have not fallen below their ordinary and high standard of interest. According to the report of one of the examiners (Rev. Henry Green), the institution evidenced its good results in the progress made by the young men themselves. Six students complete their course, of whom five go as ministers to the congregations at Lydgate, Yarmouth, Clover Street, Rochdale, Derby and Nantwich, and one undertakes a new district mission at Liverpool. The cost of the institution during the past year has exceeded the income from subscriptions by £250, but the donations given have supplied this deficiency, and leave a balance exceeding that of last year by £260. A dedication service at Cross-Street chapel, conducted by Rev. John Gordon and Rev. Samuel Bache, closed these very satisfactory proceedings.

Of all proceedings connected with what is called the "Belfast Controversy" during the past month, we omit designedly to make specific mention. We introduce the subject only to give utterance to the feeling, which we are assured extensively prevails, of deep regret at the continuance of this unnecessary and very painful discussion. It is lowering the influence of men whose good standing is of great importance to our churches, and it is sowing broadcast distrust and disunion in our denomination. For the sake of truth as well as charity, we would implore our ministers, professors and editors, one and all, to drop their arms, forget past quarrels, to unite where union is possible, and to agree to differ in peace and goodwill where conscientious differences are unavoidable.

OBITUARY.

Dec. 19, HERBERT, third son of Francis LUPTON, Esq., of Beechwood, Leeds, aged 8 years.

Dec. 20, at Dover, MARY, relict of the late Capt. John TILLY, R.N., aged 80 years.

Dec. 28, at 39, Dorset Square, London, MARGARET, wife of Joseph RIDGE, Esq., M.D., and eldest daughter of John Allen, Esq., late of Fir Grove, near Warrington, aged 45.

Dec. 29, at his residence, Ramsgate, Kent, SAMUEL SHARWOOD, Esq., in the 87th year of his age.

Jan. 5, at her residence, Gore Street, Manchester, aged 81 years, ELIZABETH, widow of the late John LYON, Esq., Greenfield House, Urmston.

Jan. 7, at Oldham, aged 36 years, ELIZABETH, wife of Mr. James TAYLOR.

Jan. 8, at Dover, ALBERT, second son of the late Mr. John PAY, of Buckland, near Dover, aged 35 years.

Jan. 9, at Rochdale, Rev. S. F. MACDONALD, aged 39 years. We trust to receive some account of this estimable and much-lamented minister.

Jan. 10, at Clifton Cottage, Monton, EMILY, the wife of George WADSWORTH, Esq., Jun., and eldest daughter of Rev. T. E. Poynting, of Monton, aged 25 years.

Jan. 10, aged 83 years, GEORGE WILLIAM MALLOWS, Esq., of Bury St. Edmunds.

Jan. 11, at Chesterfield, aged 40, HANNAH SCOTT, wife of Mr. James PEARSON, of Whittington Moor, near Chesterfield.

Jan. 12, at Rotherham, Rev. JACOB BRETTELL, for forty-three years minister of the Unitarian chapel in that town.

Jan. 14, in the 83rd year of her age, ABIGAIL, daughter of the late Mr. Joseph CARTER, of Laughton, Leicestershire.

Jan. 15, in London, LAURA MARIA, the beloved wife of John Bonham CARTER, Esq., M.P.

Jan. 16, at Somersall Hall, near Chesterfield, aged 16, ELIZA, second daughter of the late George WRIGHT, Esq., of Chesterfield.

Jan. 18, at Brighton, ELIZABETH, widow of the late Mr. Samuel FRANCIS, aged 83 years.

Jan. 20, at Greenbank, Greenock, Mr. WILLIAM CURTIS, aged 55 years.

At Farncomb, Mr. THOMAS ELLIS, late of Littleton, Guildford, in the 75th year of his age. This amiable and much-respected gentleman was son of a former minister of Mead Row, Godalming. Of the chapel there, his father had been one of the founders.

MARRIAGES.

Dec. 1, at the Elder-Yard chapel, Chesterfield, by Rev. Francis Bishop, Mr. WM. GLOSSOP to Miss MARY ANN BEARD, both of Chesterfield.

Dec. 5, in Strangeways chapel, Manchester, by Rev. Dr. Beard, Mr. JAMES HENDERSON to Miss MARY LANG WATSON, both of Manchester.

Dec. 8, at the Elder-Yard chapel, Chesterfield, by Rev. Francis Bishop, Mr. GEO. WOLDEN, of Chesterfield, to Miss ELIZA WRAGG, of Mansfield.

Dec. 12, at Cross-Street chapel, Manchester, by Rev. William Gaskell, M.A., JOSEPH ASHWORTH, Esq., of Pendleton, to AGNES, daughter of Wm. TATE, Esq., of the Crescent, Salford, and granddaughter of the late Rev. Wm. Tate, of Chorley.

Dec. 25, at the Great meeting-house, Coventry, by Rev. G. Heaviside, B.A., Mr. JAMES LOWE to Miss LUCY LEE, both of Coventry.

Dec. 26, at Bury, by Rev. John Wright, Mr. THOMAS NUTTALL, of Lomax's, to Miss MARTHA NUTTALL, of Bury.

Dec. 27, at the Great meeting, Leicester, by Rev. C. C. Coe, Mr. JOHN M. COOK to EMMA, eldest daughter of Mr. T. W. HODGES, both of Leicester.

Jan. 1, at the General Baptist chapel, Horsham, Mr. THOMAS EVERSHED, Jun., of Billingshurst, to MARY, only surviving daughter of Mr. William KENSETT, of Horsham.

Jan. 1, at the Unitarian General Baptist chapel, Chatham, by Rev. W. H. Quinn, Mr. THOMAS SWAN to Miss LESSEY, both of Chatham.